

# THE LIBERATOR.

VOL. VI.

OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD—OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND.

NO. 36.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.]

[SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1836.]

## THE LIBERATOR

14 PUBLISHED WEEKLY, AT  
NO. 46, WASHINGTON-STREET, BY  
ISAAC KNAPP.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

### TERMS.

\* TWO DOLLARS per annum, always payable in advance.  
All letters and communications must be post paid. The rule is imperative, in order to shield us from the frequent imposition of our enemies.—Those, therefore, who wish their letters to be taken from the Post Office by us, will be careful to pay their postage.

\* An advertisement making one square, or a space of equal length and breadth, will be inserted three times for one dollar.

### SLAVERY.

[From the Birmingham Philanthropist of May, 1836.]

#### ENGLISH OPINIONS OF THE CONDUCT OF DR. COX AND HOBY, THE BAPTIST DEPUTATION TO THIS COUNTRY.

Extract from a Review of THE BAPTISTS IN AMERICA: a Narrative of the Deputation from the Baptist Union in England to the United States and Canada. By the Rev. F. A. Cox, D. D., L. D.; and the Rev. J. Hoby, D. D. London: T. Ward & Co. Paternoster-row.

We have a long account of the proceedings of the Triennial Convention at Richmond, which discussed many questions and subjects, but by no means touched on that of slavery. The deputation state, in their own defence for not introducing it, that it was forbidden by the laws of the State to entertain the question: but they shall speak for themselves.

Expectations, it appears, were entertained that we should have stood forward not merely as abolitionists, which we were universally known to be, but as advocates of particular measures, and associates with a specific agency, sent for the avowed purpose of lecturing upon the subject of emancipation. On this account alone, it may be proper here to introduce a topic, which, otherwise, would not have been touched upon in these details. Further remarks will be necessary hereafter, in advertising to another meeting. At present, we have only to explain that the laws of the State prohibit all such public discussion in Virginia, as that which it had been imagined we might have introduced at Richmond; consequently, the convention would have been dissolved by the magistrates, had it been attempted. But the convention itself would not and could not have been convened, with the understanding that the abolition of Slavery was to be discussed; and inasmuch as such discussion in the triennial meeting of the missionary society, would not have approved itself to the majority of delegates assembled for other purposes, they would have dissolved themselves without, had it been attempted, meeting magisterial interference.

According to this, one part of Christianity is not allowed to be spoken of by the State. What, then, is the duty of Christians? To speak of it notwithstanding the prohibition of the State. Had the apostles only preached that part of Christianity which was permitted by the different States they went to, how much of that glorious system would have come down to us to this day? Just as much as enjoins obedience to civil rulers! We do not deny, that Messrs. Cox and Hoby had a perfect right to hold their tongues on any subject they pleased; but after having done so, we hope they do not mean to lay claim to the title of Evangelists and Christian missionaries; and to evade those words of a faithful servant and apostle of the Lord Jesus, to themselves, 'Take ye to record, that I am free from the blood of all men: for I have not shunned to declare the whole counsel of God.'

True they tell us that they held some private conversation with a few individuals on the great question; and we feel bound to quote their own words.

'The whole time of this visit to Richmond might have been occupied, could it have been so consistently with duty, in a participation of the polite hospitalities of the gentry resident in the neighborhood, as well as in delightful intercourse with Christian friends of all denominations. But one or two invitations only could be accepted, when, among other topics, it was invariably our object to elicit opinions relative both to the Indian tribes and the colored people. On the latter subject, and that connected with Slavery, we were anxious not to leave the south without a faithful and solemn expression of our own principles and feelings, and those of our brethren at home, in as large a private party of influential brethren as could be convened. It was intrusted to a brother, in whom the fullest confidence might be reposed, to invite those with whom it would be most important to confer, and from whose conversation the most information might be obtained to guide our own judgments relative to a public co-operation with the abolition agency, and the society about to hold its anniversary in N. York.

There are no terms in which we have been accustomed in England to express our abhorrence of Slavery, which were not freely employed on this occasion. The same arguments we and others at home have used, in order to repel those which have always been adduced in support of this system, were employed there for the same purpose; and solemn appeals were made to the brethren on the influence which the Church of Christ in general, and our own section of it in particular, ought to exert. The honor put upon our own brethren, who not only first suffered for Christ's sake, and then became instrumental in rescuing his suffering flock, was adduced; and in return, each of the brethren assembled gave, consecutively, an opinion upon the general aspect of their affairs, and the existing movements of various parties. We had no reason to regret having sought this conference, which may not have been unattended with benefit on the minds of our friends. We trust that our next meeting, whether on earth or in heaven, will be marked by reciprocal and joyous congratulations on our own freedom from every unholty prejudice, and the universal happiness of an emancipated world.'

Let us imagine that Christ and his apostles had mentioned to a few friends in private, the more unpopular parts of the Gospel; and that these again had trusted them with a few more "in whom the fullest confidence might be reposed," how much good would it have done the world?—Would Paganism have fallen, and civilization been carried on throughout Europe? This privacy of imparting the doctrines of abolition, is more like the priests of the Eleusian mysteries, than preachers of the Gospel. If the Baptists of England wish to hold closer communion with the Baptists of America, whilst they have the filthy garment of Slavery on them, we must be obliged to conclude that the Baptists in England do not think Slavery sinful, or that they do not care about sin. If these conclusions be denied, then we want to know what Drs. Cox and Hoby went to America for?

In the chapter on New York, this business is treated of fully, but in our opinion exceedingly unsatisfactorily. The reasons given for taking no part in Anti-Slavery meetings, and yet joining in every other affair, must be very clear and powerful to convince us of the validity of them. Unfortunately, we are of opinion, that this is the very worst performed part of the book. Whether it is the strong feeling which we entertain on this subject, or the embarrassing position in which the authors were placed, we know not, but certainly, we think their apology forms their condemnation. They state that they received invitations to attend the New York Anti-Slavery meeting, and were even advertised as about to take certain resolutions, and yet they say they did not feel that they had any authority as strangers and visitors to obstruct themselves on the meeting. After such conduct, it can hardly be a matter of surprise, that they were denounced as recreants to their principles, and stigmatized as traitors to the cause of abolition. The following is a fine piece of that kind of shuffling which among Catholics, we call *Jesuitism*, but among some denominations of Christians, we fear is only denominated *pious caution*:

'The Slave question is doubtless one of humanity and religion; but it is also one of internal policy, relating to the civil administration of the country. It is a question between independent States and the federal Government, and has no inconsiderable relation to the elections of Congress. Reasoning from the power of our own consolidated government, we are apt to infer, that it is only for the Congress of the United States to speak the word, and the enslaved will be free. This is not the case. Congress has no more authority to dissolve the relation between the master and his slave, in the different States, than it has to prohibit Great Britain, by law, from impressing and flogging her seamen. Shielded by the constitution, each State is sovereign and independent, admitting of no dictation or control by Congress, either in civil or criminal matters. The laws of Congress have reference to general relations—the protection of commerce—offences committed on the high seas, and intercourse with other nations. No law of Congress could touch even a murderer, who must be condemned or acquitted by the law of the State in which the offence was committed. Public proceedings on our part, would therefore, have entangled us with the politics of the country.

'My colleague and I were not pledged by any expressed or understood engagement to attend the anniversary of the anti-Slavery Society. The document with which we were intrusted, and by which we were sent to America, abstained from all allusion to the subject of Slavery, expressly that we might go unfettered, and act according to our judgment in any emergency. The wishes of our own hearts were indeed well known as to the general question, but the necessity or propriety of attending this or that particular meeting could not, and was never attempted to be decided at the distance of 3,000 miles, and in total ignorance of existing circumstances.'

Their own denomination understood that they had a mission on the subject of Slavery, but it appears they did not understand the encyclical letter of the board. Happy letter! It was furnished expressly at the delegates own suggestion. Slavery was not mentioned in it. They were to understand all about Slavery, without a word being mentioned. They were to see the American Churches, and form a union with them, and Slavery was to be winked at. This is the first step towards admitting Slavery into our own country. Those who can tolerate Slavery are in a fair way to practice it.

But we dismiss the subject, being sick of such temporising and expediency in a great and vital question of Christianity. If men can be Christians and hold Slaves, buy slaves, sell slaves, torture and kill slaves—why then thieves and whoremongers, and adulterers, and liars may be Christians also. Churches in every nation may make choice of the sin which suits their peculiar position, and then bargain for silence on the subject. There is no fear of their being rejected from communion with other Churches. They will have dear brethren delegated to them, to see them and they will be delighted with their order, increase, devotion, and respectability!

#### [From the Hampshire Republican.] CLERICAL DESPOTISM.

MR. EDITOR.—You will find in the New York Evangelist of the 9th inst. a series of resolutions passed by the General Association of Connecticut. A few weeks since, by the General Association of Massachusetts. The objects of the resolutions, as far as can be gathered from the studied ambiguity of their phraseology and reasoning, are two. First—To check the present effort for reform, and to put a restraint upon public lecturers on abolition, &c. Secondly—To put a stop to 'revivals,' so far as they have been heretofore promoted by the action of evangelists among congregations having settled pastors.

These resolutions will have as much power to stop reform, as the Pope's Bull would have upon the people of England, in the time of Henry VIII. The slavish devotees of the 'Mother Church' would reverence the Bull. Such congregational Christians in Massachusetts and Connecticut as already accord in sentiment with these resolutions, will heed them. But, sir, for one I shall

not heed them. I respect the congregational ministers of Massachusetts. As men of piety and undoubted philanthropy they are to be regarded in a totally different light from a proud, selfish, licentious pope: and it is on this account alone that I deem the resolutions worthy of notice.

But, sir, I repeat, I shall not be governed by them.

I am called upon by these resolutions as a good Christian and a lover of order, not to hear a lecturer on the subject of abolition, moral reform, &c., without the approbation of my pastor.

He who made me is God—my ears are his—I shall ask him what I may hear, and not my pastor. God has ordained Jesus Christ to be my only Lord. This Jesus has redeemed me with his own blood. My soul, my body with all my members and faculties are his. They shall be used to promote his honor and his glory. I cannot heed these resolutions, therefore, because they require me to pay that homage to my pastor which I owe to my Lord and Master in Heaven.

Again, I reject the spirit of the resolutions because they are based upon the assumption of false principles. They assume that the pastor of a church is a sun; the source of light, and fountain of wisdom; and that we laymen are dark planets, capable only of reflecting such light as may fall upon us from our pastor, and dependent entirely upon him for all knowledge we have or can have; and that all abolition lecturers, all revival evangelists that may arrive among us are comets, and though very irregular creatures, are bound to travel obsequiously with us around our sun.

This is no arrangement of our Lord's. It is wholly a device of human imagination. Jesus Christ is the Light of the world. He is no respecter of persons. Whoever asks of him will receive.

Man has always coveted power over his fellow man. The first disciples even in the presence of their Lord repeatedly discovered this disposition. Jesus as often rebuked them for it. If he ordained anything he ordained that his disciples should live together as brethren. His language is, 'To sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give; but it shall be given to him for whom it is prepared of my Father.' If Jesus had no power to create an office, giving one man authority over another, certainly Peter had no such power; and all claim of this power from the Pope of Rome down to the General Association of Massachusetts is mere usurpation. The sentiment contained in the text, seems to be this—God will endow whom he pleases with the spirit of truth; and the Christian brother is to be respected not according to his color, or his nation, or the age in which he may live, or the peculiar privileges he may enjoy from personal intimacy on earth, with his Saviour; or any station in an office established by the Son; but according as he may be endowed by the Father with a spirit of love, of knowledge and of truth.

Another principle assumed in these resolutions, is, that the cause of religion will be promoted just in proportion as the regular clergy are respected.

I hold this principle to be false both in theory and practice. Practically it has been proved, fully proved to be the source of more darkness and slavish idolatry on the part of the people, and more arrogant impiety, and hard hearted selfishness and cruelty on the part of the clergy, than ever proceeded from any moral principle of man's adoption. All the blood which has been poured upon the earth from the hearts of Christians, since the days of Constantine, has been sacrificed to this principle. All the impurities and immoralities of the church of Rome were begotten and nursed and suffered to live by the side of Christian names and Christian hopes through the aid of this principle.

The present death, faithlessness, cowardice and worldly conformity among members of the Protestant church, and that too in the midst of high Christian hopes and professions, and great imaginary zeal, is sustained by this principle.—The man is conscious of his own death. He knows that he has but little love towards Jesus Christ and but very little benevolence towards his brethren, and yet he is too cowardly to leave his parish, and too selfish to speak his praises, tenfold more than to speak the praises of his Redeemer: he is a great advocate for high salaries and splendid parsonages, and therefore vainly imagines himself a great Christian.

This principle is false in theory. It is opposed to the fundamental principle of Christ's kingdom. He came on purpose to stain the pride of all human glory, and to bring into contempt all the honorable of the earth. He came to deliver man from worshipping his fellow man, and to bring his soul into direct fellowship and obedience to God. The language of God in this benevolent dispensation is—'Cause ye from man.' 'My son, give me thine heart.'

Again, I object to these resolutions, because, in the restrictive consequences, they will operate if they operate at all, just where there is no need of restraint. The infidel will not be induced by them to respect religion. He will only feel a deeper contempt. The vain glorious Christian who is recklessly seeking his own honor rather than the glory of his Lord, will not be checked in his career. In these efforts of the regular clergy to gain for themselves the respect of man, he receives a fresh impulse to pursue his laurels. The timid Christian, and he alone, will regard them. Yet the timid Christian is in no danger of bringing disorder into the church. He needs encouraging, not restraining. I regret the passage of these resolutions, because I view it as decidedly a retrograde step. However much I may respect the men who voted for them, it is impossible for me to look upon the act in any other light than as evincive of mistaken zeal; and a false conception on the part of the ministers concerned of their own relative standing in the church; and of a deep ignorance both of the nature of man and of the religion of Jesus. But of one thing I am sure—the kingdom of God will come. In spite of the popish or protestant clergy, in spite of the arrogant pride of the Southern slaveholder, and the cowardly and cunning selfishness of the Northern politician—the kingdom of God will

come; and with it peace and liberty to man. God will commission his angel to preach the everlasting gospel; and he will fly wherever God shall send him, without dropping his wings to ask leave of a puny pastor.—In the clouds of heaven the Son of God will be revealed with all the glory of his Father upon him.—Then man will forget his earthly dignity, and blush to think that he ever courted honor from a fellow worm. S. J. C.

[From the New York Evangelist.]

### EVANGELISTS.

To the Editor of the New York Evangelist:

SIR.—In several late religious newspapers I have seen an account of a meeting at Norfolk, in Connecticut, of sixteen ministers, who were called "the General Association of Connecticut." This body, although very respectable, is one to which the Congregational churches of Connecticut have no relation, as they have no voice in its organization, nor in the election of the members of which it is composed. It is, of course self constituted, self-appointed; and so far as the proceedings of this body are confined to the cultivation of harmony and good will among the clerical gentlemen of the State, its efforts are praiseworthy and altogether to be commended. It is true, indeed, that these efforts, if they are always made in sincerity, are not always crowned with success: for while one says, I am of Paul, another, I am of Apollos, and another, I am of Cephas, it is apparent that they do not harmonize sufficiently to be of one mind and of one heart. But when this self-constituted body undertake to instruct the churches, and prescribe to them what they shall read and who they shall hear, it cannot be considered strange if their votes or resolutions, or instructions, or recommendations, call them which you please, should be questioned, and their character examined.

I suppose it to be well known, that the Congregational churches in Conn. do not acknowledge any ecclesiastical court with authority over the churches. A particular church possesses and retains all authority over its own members within itself, and if any appeal is made it is merely for advice. This plan was adopted by the primitive churches of the State, undoubtedly because they took the New Testament for their guide. Our Lord, (Mat. xviii. 15-17.) directs in the case of personal offence, that the subject shall finally be brought before the church, and if the offender "will not hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." In the case supposed, the church was finally to decide. No appeal to any other ecclesiastical court is mentioned; the fathers of New England thought that none could be vindicated or should be allowed.—And in what is said, Acts xv. relative to what is called the council of Jerusalem, they found no more difficulty than do the churches of the present day. That body was composed of "the apostles, elders and brethren;" let such a body be now assembled, and the congregational churches will cheerfully submit to their dictation. That body could say, it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, the churches will put themselves under the government of any body of men who can use this language in sincerity and in truth.

It may be said that appeals are sometimes made from a particular church to a consociation. It is true; in most cases, however, these appeals are merely for advice. If there are any other, of which I am not aware, they form an exception to the remark. But whatever authority the consociations may have, the General Association has none. The former are composed of ministers and delegates chosen by the churches; the latter is formed of ministers only—the members are appointed by ministers only.

I have mentioned the subject of ecclesiastical courts, that the reader may clearly understand what kind of superintendence the General Association of Connecticut possesses over the Congregational churches, and of course how much weight should be attached to their resolutions? At the meeting of the Gen. Association to which I have referred, several resolutions relative to evangelists and itinerant preachers, and sundry other things, were discussed, and as it is said, passed unanimously. We have, then, the opinions of sixteen of the Congregational ministers of Conn. on these subjects; and so far as they are supported by facts and arguments, they ought to have as much influence as the opinions of any other sixteen men of the same information, and of similar character. The resolutions may be found by the reader in the Evangelist of July 9th.

I shall pass over the two first resolutions for the present, and make some remarks on the third. It is as follows:—

3. Resolved, That the existence in the churches of an order of itinerant evangelists, devoted especially to the business of excitement and to the promotion of revivals, cannot be reconciled with the respect and influence which are indispensable to the usefulness and stability of the stated ministry, to the harmony of ecclesiastical action in the churches, and to the steady and accumulating influence of the gospel and its institutions, and to the purity in doctrine and discretion in action.

This is a long sentence, and comprehends many subjects; I must therefore take it up one part at a time.

Who are evangelists, Mr. Editor? I suppose it will be agreed that they are preachers of the gospel—regularly ordained ministers—who have no particular location, and are, of course, *itinerants*, if indeed they act at all as ministers.—How do they differ from those sixteen gentlemen who denounce them? Merely in this: these persons preach and labor as ministers, but they do it at home; while the evangelists are *itinerant* ministers. Here then is the sum and substance of their offending. Let the evangelists *only stay at home*, and they will never hear again from the sixteen gentlemen who met at Norfolk. Let them "hold on the even tenor of their way," and never make another effort for "the promotion of revivals," in any other place than in their own societies, and they will be honored and respected, no denunciation will again reach their ears from the ministers who happen to occupy at present some of the pulpits in the State of Connecticut. But is

it so, that because a minister of the gospel is an *itinerant*, he must therefore be held up to the suspicion of the public? Because his benevolence is expansive, and he imitates his Master in going about and doing good, therefore the churches must be cautioned, and warned, and exhorted not to hear or employ him? At what period of the church do we live, Mr. Editor? Is it in the dark ages, when the monks, the ecclesiastics of that period, took the government of the churches into their own hands, and managed them according to their own council? Or is it in the nineteenth century, a period when every child is boasting of the great increase of light and liberty?

### COMMUNICATIONS.

New York, Aug. 5, 1836.

DEAR GARRISON.—It was with feelings of regret that I discovered in your paper of the 23d and 30th ultimo, what I consider the germ of animosity and contention among brethren.—Why Sir, cannot abolitionists compromise the peculiar articles of their christian faith, since their association is not to advocate or promote or defend these articles, but to dethrone the monster Slavery?

The "holy Sabbath" has been assailed. A writer who subscribes himself "a friend of the American Union," probably encouraged by some editorial hints of the 23d ult. comes out boldly, and in the face of Presbyterian, Baptists, Methodist and other christian abolitionists, says that "the Lord's day, the first day of the week, was kept as a matter of fashion and convenience," without any binding obligation upon us. Admitting his assertion to be true, which I think no true enlightened christian will admit, still there is a wanton spirit manifested, which will, if cherished, foment jealousies and contentions, and cause divisions in the anti-Slavery ranks. I can see no more reason for mooted the question relative to the sanctitude of the Sabbath, by abolitionists, as such, than for commencing a regular theological warfare to array Calvinistic abolitionists against the friends of the slave who are, in their christian belief, denominated Armenians, Baptists, Quakers &c. &c. Indeed it is a challenge to every abolitionist who believes that the Sabbath day is hallowed. And let abolitionists once commence disputes upon doctrines in which they are not agreed, and abolition, a question upon which they are agreed, will be handed over to the enemy. What will be the consequences? To set the old school Presbyterian upon the new—to pit the Methodist against the Calvinist—to root New Schoolism or Old Schoolism or Calvinism or Arminianism or Quakerism out of the anti-Slavery Society, and make the society a pure orthodox institution, which will be accomplished by the foregoing means only when the members have experienced the fate of the Killenny cats. "A friend to the American Union" probably does not wish these discussions and contentions to take place; then why broach the subject? He is probably not willing that they only who disregard the sanctity of the Sabbath shall be found in the anti-Slavery ranks; then why present a model for an Orthodox anti-Slavery Society? It is due to the society of Friends, to which the writer probably belongs, to say of them that they as a religious society, have done well, acted nobly towards the slave, for which they deserve the commendation of all other religious denominations. And it is due to all abolitionists of other religious denominations to say of them, that they have awarded the due meed of thanks and praise to the Friends for so doing, and given abundant testimonials of their good will towards that class, who are proverbially the friend of the slave. It is also due to them to say, that since the commencement of the combined Anti-Slavery effort, no one of them has been known by hint or innuendo, much less openly and avowedly, to assail the religious belief of a Friend upon points not appertaining to Slavery.

Had the writer chosen this subject to expatiate upon, disjoined from the anti-Slavery cause, it would perhaps have been well enough. He could then have stood upon distinct anti-Sabbath ground and received the shafts of his adversaries without an anti-Slavery fort for his protection, or an anti-Slavery magazine to furnish him with weapons. Does he expect to find arguments in the sin of Slavery to prove that the sanctity of the Sabbath is mere Puritanic superstition?—Or that the observance of the Sabbath is sheer Pharisaic strictness and gloomy penance because tyrants hold their fellow men in bondage? True, there is a most gross inconsistency between a strict observance of the Sabbath day and man-stealing, but because man-stealing is diabolic and murderous, is the observance of the Sabbath therefore a piece of superstition? You say no. Then why, as O'Connell said, hold up another light? Why give our enemies an occasion to misrepresent and censure us?

Let us all be united—Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists and Quakers until we get our foot upon the neck of the grand enemy, Slavery, and

"It is due to the Society of Friends, as the sentence seems to imply a censure, to say that "A friend of the American Union," was not a member of that society.



dirk him to the heart; then if we have nothing better to do, it will be a good time to show our prowess in a civil fight. Then indeed we can no longer be anti-slavery brethren—then no pledge will bind us against a common enemy, it will be fair play and no compromise. At such a time there are not wanting those in our ranks, who would run a tilt with a friend of the American Union.

#### NEW-ENGLAND UNION ACADEMY.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., Aug. 16, 1836.  
The subscriber, as agent and teacher of the New-England Union Academy, at Providence, R. I., acknowledges the receipt of the following sums of money in support of the school, from April, 1835, to August, 1836:

Collected at Rev. Mr. Cummings' church, Concord, N. H.	\$62.00
" at Rev. Mr. Eaton's church, Lowell,	17.00
" at Rev. Mr. Porter's do. do.	20.75
" at 2d Congregational do. do.	32.00
" at Rev. Mr. Goodale's church, Great Falls, Somersworth, N. H.	12.00
" Rev. Mr. Cayton's do. do.	10.00
" Rev. Mr. Williams' church, Dover,	6.00
Of sundry individuals at S. Berwick, Me.,	6.00
At the Methodist Church, Portsmouth, N. H.	6.00
At Rev. Mr. Shepard's church, Hallowell, Me.	40.00
Collected at same church, at a former time, & paid over by Dea. Dole,	10.00
Mr. G. G. Wilder, Augusta, Me.,	5.00
Rev. Mr. Tappan, do.	3.00
At a meeting at the Town House, do.	3.56
Mr. George W. Shepard, Portland, Me.,	3.00
At Lowell, by John Levi, agent for the school,	119.77
Of sundry individuals at New Bedford, Ms.,	30.00
Whole amount,	\$388.05
JOHN W. LEWIS.	

The whole expense of the school the past year, has been a little more than \$600, and with what is here acknowledged, the balance has been made up in the city of Providence. As no school can go on without patronage and support, we hope our friends through the country will extend their aid. If the different Anti-Slavery Societies, and friends of the anti-slavery cause, will assist in the intellectual improvement of the colored population of this country, so as to enable us to continue our efforts, the public mind will soon be changed in behalf of the oppressed, for whom the friends of humanity are pleading.

Any donation to be made to the school, may be sent by mail, to Rev. John W. Lewis, Providence, R. I., according to the request of the Trustees of the Institution.

WM. I. BREWER,  
Secretary of the Trustees.

#### SMITH SCHOOL.

MR. EDITOR: I believe that no paper in the city has mentioned the names of the late successful and praiseworthy candidates for the prizes in the Smith school. This school is one of the city schools, supported by the public, subject to the same regulations as the other Grammar schools, and the Teachers placed upon an equality with the other Teachers in the city; yet the Exhibitions of this school have never been mentioned in the public papers. Is this apparently marked neglect right? There may be just reasons for it, but I confess I cannot perceive the justice of keeping in the back ground the pupils in that school, who have distinguished themselves in the attainment of useful knowledge, while the names of children in other schools, no more meritorious, have been published in all the papers.

I trust, Mr. Editor, that it will give you pleasure to insert the names of those pupils of the Smith school, who received the prizes at the last Annual Exhibition. They are as follows:

ARABELLA DALTON,  
GEORGE JONES,  
JOSEPH PUTMAN,  
NESTOR FREEMAN,  
GEORGE COLBURN.

#### A MUDDY ABSTRACT.

MR. EDITOR:—A contemporary editor, whose name it is unnecessary to mention, as he only makes use of the cant of the age, says, 'That we are, in the language of Henry Clay, "the foes to slavery, and the advocates of liberty throughout the world," is a fact that we shall not deny; but we shall most resolutely oppose any party, and all parties, that may intimate an intention to take any step to invade the rights of the South, or the integrity of the Union.'

Gallant champion of rights and integrity! He reminds me of a conversation which lately took place between a shrewd and learned citizen of Boylston, and a preacher of Christianity.

The minister declared that he was very much opposed to slavery as such—that slavery was an evil in the abstract, but he should decline stirring so exciting a subject.

'Suppose,' replied the other, 'that you were to fall into a deep slough, and I should pass by while you were floundering in the mud, and very politely inform you that I was opposed to mud in the abstract, and thought it made a very uncomfortable jacket for a clergyman—but that I should set my face against interfering with your personal concerns, and so pass on and let you wallow.'

SLAVE CASE.—An application was yesterday made to the Recorder, by John P. Collier, of Somerset county, Maryland, to obtain possession, under a writ of Habeas Corpus, of Jesse Collier, whom Mr. J. F. Collier claimed as his slave. It appeared that Mr. James Collier, father of the claimant, died in 1826, and that the Orphan Court of Maryland, divided his property amongst his children, and allotted the alleged slave to the claimant, in whose possession he remained until last April, when he absconded. After that time Mr. Collier was unable to obtain any tidings of him until within a few weeks back, when a Mr. Holt, from Maryland, came to this city, and happening to see the alleged slave, wrote to his master on the subject, who immediately proceeded here and claimed him as his property. Messrs. Collier and Holt were both positive as to the identity of the slave. On the other side, Mr. Hutchings, of Oak street, deposed to having seen the alleged slave in this city in December, 1834 or 1835. Sarah Meads, a colored woman, residing in Suffolk street, also deposed that he had boarded with her more than two years back. At this stage of the proceedings, the case was adjourned until Wednesday next. [From the N. Y. Journal of Commerce of the 23d ult.]

The above case was resumed on Wednesday last and postponed again to next Wednesday. The alleged slave is defended by the Manumission Society, who have engaged as counsel Messrs. Sedgwick, Millard and Dresser.

For the claimant, Messrs. Rowley and Strang. was made to the Recorder from a committee of colored men, requesting him to notify them when any colored person was claimed as a slave, in order that they might give him legal assistance. The request was couched in very respectful language, and the Recorder promised to comply with their request.

#### BOSTON.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1836.

#### LETTER FROM MR. THOMPSON.

18, ALDEMANBURY, LONDON; }  
July 11, 1836. }

My Dear, very Dear Friend:

I have a few moments to prepare a packet for you, and scribble a few lines. They must be very few or I can send none. I forward you some numbers of the Patriot. They will show you what has been doing in London and elsewhere on the subject of American slavery. I send also the accounts just out of the press of the debate between myself and the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge. Don't fail to have it published, with accompanying notes by yourself. I mean notes exposing the falsehoods with which Mr. Breckinridge's speeches teem, many of which—from want of time solely—I was forced to leave unnoticed. Mr. Breckinridge has disgraced himself in the eyes of the Christian public of Great Britain. Don't forget to publish, with proper comments, his letter, which you will find in the Patriot. It is a most infamous document. Our friend R. B. Hall, has replied to it, and I mean to notice it presently. The other things sent will speak for themselves. They will all be full of interest to you. I sent you three weeks ago, a parcel from Glasgow by the hands of a dear friend, Mr. James Johnston, which I trust you duly received. Mr. Spencer is amongst us, and has put me in possession of the many letters and papers committed to his care for me. I have enjoyed them greatly. Yours I need not say were most deeply interesting. Our country is awake to the question and will not be permitted to slumber. You will find amongst the things sent, the first number of a periodical intended to give information to the country respecting the movements on both sides of the Atlantic—with a faithful history of the cause of immediate abolition. Mr. Price will, you may depend upon it, keep up the work to the right mark in regard to principle. By a future opportunity I shall write fully. At present I can only say, present my best regards to all. My heart is ever with you. I am delighted beyond description with the accounts of the New York and New England meetings. Onwards!! till the work is done, and we on this side the water echo the shout of jubilee on yours. Your devoted friend,  
GEO. THOMPSON.

#### SLAVERY IN AMERICA.

To the Editor of the Patriot:

SIR—The unexpected, and, I have no doubt unavoidable, absence of my friend, Mr. George Thompson, from town, imposes upon me the necessity of making one or two remarks on the insidious attempts which have been recently made to injure the cause which he has espoused, and to damage his reputation as a public man. I shall, however, say as little as possible on this subject, because I am persuaded that Mr. T. will, on his return from Scotland, give a good account of himself both to his friends and to his foes; and because I am satisfied that the spirit of malignity with which he has been attacked in certain quarters, will defeat itself.

It is asserted that the Resolution in favor of Drs. Cox and Hoby, at the annual meeting of the Baptist Union on the 22d ult. is to be considered as a complete justification of the course these Rev. gentlemen pursued in reference to the anti-slavery cause in the United States, and, consequently, condemnatory of the conduct of Mr. Thompson, in charging Dr. Cox with a dereliction of duty in that respect, when there. Though intimately acquainted with the facts of the case, I shall not, at present, give an opinion on its merits, as the question at issue between these gentlemen yet remains to be determined, before a committee of their mutual friends, unless the circumstance to which I have alluded, should render such a reference no longer desirable. In that case it is probable that I shall trouble you with a communication on the subject. But to return to the resolution of the Baptist Union. Is that resolution to be considered as justifying Dr. Cox, and condemning Mr. Thompson? We shall find the answer to this question in the circumstances which give rise to it—in the cautious terms in which it is couched—and the speech which introduced it to the meeting at which it was passed.

It is well known to the members of the Baptist Union that the resolution was drawn up in its present form in view of the difficulties of the case, and with the intention of preserving, if possible, the integrity of the Union—or, in other words, it was the result of compromise; I will not say of principle, but of feeling on the part of the thorough-going abolitionists then present, but it was never designed to exculpate Dr. Cox from the charges alleged against him; nor, by implication, to condemn Mr. T. for his bringing such charges either in New York or in this country. I confidently appeal to the gentlemen who framed the resolution, whether this is not the fact.

Now let us look at the terms of the resolution. It divides itself into two parts: the first refers to the diligence, zeal and ability with which they prosecuted the DENOMINATIONAL OBJECTS of their mission. For this they received 'the warmest thanks' of their brethren, and they richly deserved them. The second part refers to the manner in which they prosecuted 'THE SACRED CAUSE OF NEGRO EMANCIPATION,' which formed a prominent part of their mission. What does it say? Whilst the Union rejoice to learn that their delegates did, on very many occasions, convey to the ministers and churches of the Baptist Denom-

ination in America, their abhorrence of the slave system amongst them; and with a full assurance of their integrity they state that they 'regret that the state of society rendered it advisable, in their judgment, in order to the attainment of the more strictly denominational objects to refrain from introducing it in public meetings, and to withhold from the abolition society their encouragement and support.' Did the brethren approve the course of their delegates on the anti-slavery question? No! they regretted that, in their judgment, the state of society was such as to lead them to refrain from bearing their open, public and solemn protest, in the name of the Baptist Body in England against the atrocious system of slavery which exists in so large a section of their own church in America; and to withhold from the noble band of abolitionists there, their encouragement and support, in order to the attainment of the more strictly denominational objects. Is Mr. Thompson or his policy condemned? No. The Baptist Union had no right to condemn him. He was not amenable to their tribunal; and they stand very properly as a body, uncommitted either to Dr. Cox or to Mr. Thompson, in the matters at issue between them.

That I have correctly interpreted the design of the resolution, I refer for confirmation to the admirable speech of Mr. Mursell. What does he say:

'I deeply regret that they did hold it to be right to keep silence in public places, on the enormities of American slavery; nor can it be concealed from this meeting, that there is great dissatisfaction throughout the land on this account, and that comparatively few justify the conduct of the deputies in this particular. But we are not met to-day, Sir, to fan the flames of discord, or to yield to a spirit of strife, but rather to propose a healing, but uncompromising measure, and in the name and spirit of Peace, to pour oil on the troubled waters. It is due, however, to the denomination—it is due to the deputies—it is due to the American people, that we openly express the regret that we feel; it is better frankly to tell a friend his defects, than to conceal them in the bosom and mutter them behind his back. The trodden walk of life, Sir, presents scarcely any thing that is new, but wears a monotonous aspect, which offers little to awaken either pleasure or surprise; if we wish to linger in more verdant paths, we must occasionally turn aside, and must seek in the nooks which are hidden from the eye the beauties which nature discloses to those who love her. So but few opportunities occur in the course of life to attempt great actions, or to accomplish extraordinary good; but when these happen, it should be our object to seize and to improve them. Our brethren who appear among us to-day, Sir, have had such an occasion within their reach, but it is regretted throughout the land that they have permitted it to pass away. The plains of Marathon and the field of Waterloo were vulgar spots and desert places, when compared with the inspiring scenes which stretched all around them; no position of philanthropy, in my opinion, has occurred in modern times so eminent as that from which they have so silently descended. Unambitious men, to refuse this solitary offer of universal and honorable fame.'

Before the Rev. gentleman concluded his eloquent address he added:

'Suffer me to suppose, let it be imagined for a moment, that impressed with the greatness of the occasion, and touched with pity for degraded millions, one of our deputies had risen in the midst of that assembly, and in a calm and dignified manner uttered the language of kind remonstrance—we are to be told they would not have been heard? Why the genius of slavery must have crouched before them!—it would have been analogous, with the scene sketched by the hand of our great poet when the celestial visitor descended, and at his presence 'abashed the devil stood.' It is regretted therefore, Sir, that the friends of abolition on the American continent have been grievously disappointed. Nor would this more open course, had our brethren chosen to adopt it, been in any measure inconsistent with the other parts of their design, they might have lifted their voice most distinctly in the cause of freedom without weakening the effect or limiting the just influence of their more religious instructions; if some had closed their ears against them, others would have listened more intently to them; if the curse of the slaveholder had come upon them, the blessing of the poor slave (a rich compensation) would have attended them. Besides this, Sir, their conduct would have approved itself to Him 'who has made of one blood all nations to dwell upon the face of the earth'; the blessed God would have rested with peculiar complacency in a glorious deed to which he seemed by His Providence to have summoned them, and those signs of the divine favor which have attended our brethren to our midst would have been multiplied, since they are our actions rather than our person, which God approves. On these, then, as well as on other accounts, I unite with thousands throughout the provinces of this empire in sentiments of unfeigned regret.'

That the meeting fully sympathized with the remarks of Mr. Mursell the loud applause with which they were received fully proves.

I had intended to have noticed some other points connected with this matter, but I fear I have already trespassed too much on your columns. I beg, therefore, to subscribe myself

Yours, respectfully,

JOHN SCOBLE.

LONDON, July 1, 1836.

#### THOMPSON AND BRECKINRIDGE.

Some of our pro-Slavery papers are trying to exult over the issue of the discussion in Glasgow, between Messrs. Thompson and Breckinridge, and on the strength of letters from correspondents abroad are publishing that Breckinridge has won a complete victory. His coolness, calmness and self-possession, his ability in argument, and his perfect success are eulogised in glowing paragraphs, set forth with a due flourish of trumpets, and decorated with a due display of epithets of commendation, while the vocabulary of abuse is as usual emptied upon the head of his opponent. How much truth there is in these representations of—nobody knows whom—these stories without a responsible name, may, in part at least, be gathered from a few extracts which we have made below, from such British papers as have come to hand since the discussion.

The London Patriot of June 20th, contains the first evening's debate. From the editorial comments we select the following passages:

'American Slavery! The more this is discussed, the more odious does it seem in the estimation of all those who fairly enter upon the subject. We wish not to prejudice

the points at issue between the Rev. Mr. Breckinridge and Mr. Thompson; but as far as the discussion has yet proceeded, and has reached us, the facts and conclusions of Mr. Thompson; remain unshaken. Slavery is the National sin of America. It is, in fact, the sin of every State that does not lift up its voice or which refuses to protest against it. Look at the Capital, the seat of the Federal Government. What a satire does it exhibit on the freedom, independence, and the rights of man.'

The same excellent paper of the 22d of June, gives a continuation of the debate, and remarks upon it:

'The two main points upon which Mr. Breckinridge and Mr. George Thompson seem to be at issue, are, first, whether Slave-holding in America is a national sin, or the sin only of certain States or sections of the nation; and secondly, whether the American Abolitionists have taken the most discreet and legitimate way to accomplish their object. The sin of American Slave trading lies, however, at the very door of the American government. So long as the Slave market exists in the Federal Capital, that Algers of the Free Republic, and Congress licenses the monstrous wickedness within the immediate domain of the supreme authority of the Republic, a brand of infamy must attach to the very name of America. Such was the view which President JEFFERSON took of the national sin, when he used those memorable words, "I tremble for my country, when I reflect that God is just, and that his justice will not sleep forever."

But the peculiar aggravation of American Slave-holding is, not that it is the sin of the Federal Government, and therefore implicating the whole nation, who are pledged by the terms of the Union, to be partakers, by more than connivance, in the sin of the Slave-holding States—not that it is a National sin, so much as that it is, in America the sin of the church. This is the horrible fact which renders even our fraternizing with Slave-holding churches and Slave-flogging pastors and elders, a questionable, or at least, an embarrassing position. That Slavery existed in the Southern States, we always knew; but the extent to which the Presbyterian, Baptist, and Wesleyan churches were directly implicated in upholding the system, was not by any means generally understood in this country till very recently. That Slaves were the property of churches, was not even dreamed of. How could it be supposed that, while the Northern States were glorying in having abolished slavery—no great sacrifice to virtue, however, as slave cultivation is confessedly a very unprofitable sin in such latitudes—the very churches of the Middle and Southern States were trafficking in the blood and sinews of their dark-skinned fellow countrymen and fellow Christians.

Where is the Dissenting Church in the three kingdoms that could for a single day tolerate this inefable outrage upon the members of Christ's body.

As to the other question—whether the American Abolitionists have acted prudently or not—all we shall say at present is, that we have never yet seen the vague charges brought against them supported by satisfactory evidence. Thomas Clarkson, Granville Sharp, and William Wilberforce had to encounter not less malignant aspersions and bitter resentment from their countrymen than Garrison, Tappan, Cox, and Jay have been pursued with by their American brethren.'

On our last page will be found a paragraph on the subject of the debate, from the Birmingham Philanthropist, which we would request our readers to peruse in this connection. We will only add now, the notice which Rev. Mr. Price gives of the discussion, in his new periodical, 'Slavery in America.'

'An important and deeply interesting discussion on the subject of American slavery has recently taken place in Glasgow, between Mr. George Thompson, the intrepid and able champion of the negro race, and the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, an American Presbyterian minister.'

'At present we have only space to express our admiration of the pre-eminent ability and entire self command which Mr. Thompson displayed throughout the discussion, and to tender him our thanks for the large mass of valuable information with which he has supplied the public. Never was a cause more triumphantly defended, nor the sophistries and evasions of an acute and merciless opponent more completely exposed. It would afford us pleasure to be able to record our approbation of the spirit in which Mr. Breckinridge conducted his part of the discussion. But truth compels us to say, that we have been grieved and disgusted at the rancorous hostility towards his opponent, which his speeches betrayed. He evidently sought to destroy the public reputation of Mr. Thompson, rather than to exhibit the real character of American Slavery. No opportunity was lost of aiming a mortal blow at the character of one whose intrepidity, disinterestedness, and successful exertions, on behalf of suffering humanity, entitle him to the respect of every virtuous mind. It is humiliating to see a Christian minister, more especially one who appears amongst us as a representative of a highly respectable and religious body in America so completely surrendered to the influence of a bad passion. Our own impression in reading the report of the discussion has been, that Mr. Breckinridge must have brought to this country feelings of deep mortification, arising from Mr. Thompson's successful exposure of the delusive and wicked nature of the colonization scheme; and that his spleen mastered his judgment, and vented itself in a manner discreditable to his character, both as a gentleman and a Christian. The result of the discussion may be inferred from the following extract from a note addressed to Mr. Thompson, by one of the most respectable ministers in Scotland, who had been present during the debate: "My dear Sir—How are you? Glad and grateful, I dare say. God has given you and your cause victory and triumph. Poor Breckinridge! what a crushed man!"

#### 'SLAVERY IN AMERICA.'

This is the title of a monthly publication just commenced in London, by Rev. Thomas Price, the first No. of which, we received by a late arrival. Its primary object is, as its title imports, to give the British public a faithful delineation of that system of complicated abominations which pollutes, curses and disgraces our country.—The Editor's well known ability, faithfulness, and zeal in the cause of emancipation, furnishes a sufficient guarantee that the work will be conducted in such a manner, as to render it a valuable auxiliary in the great struggle now going on for the extermination of Slavery throughout the world. We subjoin some extracts from the editor's "address to the reader," setting forth the occasion, object, spirit and intended course of the publication.

'It has originated in the deep interest recently awakened amongst the British Christians in the character and extent of the slave system existing among their American brethren. The real nature and operation of this unhallored system has been but lately known. A presumption

favorable to its character was derived from the religious profession of its apologists and defend-ers.'

'But recent communications have clearly established the painful and humiliating fact, that in America, the land of boasted freedom and religious privilege, the inherent depravity of the slave system has been signally displayed in effecting one of the most disastrous triumphs over the charities of our nature and the principles of our faith which history records.'

'The knowledge of these facts has kindled a deep and absorbing interest in a large portion of the religious people of this empire, and the inquiry is now becoming general, What can we do to rescue Christianity from reproach, and to save our American brethren from the natural consequences of their guilt in upholding this horrid system of impiety and wrong? It is to meet this inquiry, and to aid in the adoption of such measures as are calculated to arouse the conscience and to call forth the religious principles of the people of the United States, that this periodical is commenced.'

'It will treat slavery as a palpable violation of the divine law, as an act of injustice towards man, and of injury towards God, a sin to be repented of and forsaken, rather than an evil to be mitigated or a misfortune to be mourned over. The imperative obligation of Christians to seek its destruction will be urgently enforced, and the delusive character of the pleas which are urged in defence of silence and inactivity will be fearlessly exposed.'

'The assistance he has engaged, and the sources of information which are open to him, leave no doubt on his mind of his being able to present to his readers an accurate and full-length portrait of the slave system as it is interwoven with the social compact and religious operations of America.'

'It will be his especial aim to point out its injurious influence on the religious sensibilities and character of the people of that country.'

'The present publication is also designed to be a magazine of information from which American abolitionists and their countrymen at large may learn what is taking place amongst us in reference to this great moral question. The movements of religious bodies in their intercourse with America, together with the resolutions passed at the various meetings throughout the country, will be faithfully recorded; and no effort will be spared by which the moral influence of British Christians may be made to bear on the extinction of an evil which defaces the beauty and enfeebles the energies of the transatlantic churches.'

This No. contains a brief notice of the progress of the Anti-Slavery cause in the United States, commencing with the issuing of proposals for publishing the Liberator—bestowing by the way a word of merited commendation upon the philanthropic Lundy, and tracing the history of the cause onward, noting all the most prominent events up to the organization of the National Society in December, 1833, and copying at length the Declaration of Sentiments, which was then adopted, together with the signatures affixed to it. Of this document the Editor says "a more important and eloquent exposition of Anti-Slavery principles was perhaps never written. It is worthy of being inscribed in letters of gold."

The concluding paragraph of the notice, we give entire.

'These brief notices of the origin and progress of the abolition cause in America demonstrate its purely benevolent and religious character, and the peaceful means by which it expects to accomplish its purpose. It is neither sectarian or political in spirit or designs. It aims at the overthrow of the most intolerable and iniquitous system of Slavery which exists in the world.'

The men who conduct it are wise in counsel, and decisive in action; and notwithstanding the fierce and brutal spirit with which they have been continually assailed, it is clear that, from the success which has hitherto attended their labors, the doom of Slavery is sealed.'

#### THE TEXAS QUESTION IN ENGLAND.

It will be seen by the following article from the London Patriot of July 6, that the affairs of Texas are beginning to arrest the attention of the British public, and have even become a subject of consideration in Parliament.

'The British public ought to be made aware of what is going on at present in Texas; of the true cause and the true nature of the contest between the Mexican authorities and the American slave jobbers. None of the daily journals, however, Liberal or Tory, have cared to bring the facts under the notice of their readers.'

Texas has long been the Naboth's vineyard of Brother JONATHAN. For twenty years or more an anxiety has been manifested to push backward the boundary of the United States territory, of which the Sabine river is the agreed line, so as to include the rich alluvial lands of the Delta of the Colorado, at the head of the Gulf of Mexico. The mere lust of territory, which, in the Americans, seems a national passion, is not, however, the sole cause of this anxiety to appropriate, by fraud or force, what unquestionably belongs to the Mexican territory. There are stronger passions at work, deeper interests at stake. Texas belongs to a Republic which has abolished slavery; to an object of the Americans is to convert it to the field of slave cultivation, and a market for the Maryland Slave-trade, but, by annexing it to the Federal Union, to strengthen in Congress the preponderating influence of the Southern or slaveholding States.

This atrocious project is the real origin and cause of the pretended contest for Texian independence; a war, or the part of the United States, of unprovoked aggression for the vilest of all purposes. That we are not speaking too strongly, or without evidence, our readers will be convinced, on reading the speech of Mr. J. Q. Adams, an Ex-President of the United States, delivered in the House of Representatives in May last, which we transcribe from the American papers. "What did we now see in Texas?" he exclaimed. "Why, Americans fighting for the re-establishment of slavery within that State where it had been abolished. He repeated the question. Did not every man who heard him know, although the House had not seen fit to grant him the documents by which he could establish the fact, that the war raging in Texas is a war for the restoration of slavery where it had been abolished? And you, Sir, your own Government has given occasion for a man at the head of the Mexican Government, to make war in the cause of human liberty; and he might invade your own territory."



Georgia. But supposing Santa Anna destroyed, did they think that they would be allowed, without further difficulty, to annex Texas as a territory of the United States? There is a voice of Liberty here, with this addition—that it is a feeling of liberty to all races, to all nations and colors. That country has set you an example within the last two years, of proclaiming freedom to her slaves in the very vicinity of her own country. Ay, that is the country for which, for abolitionists! Before you admit that country into your Union, you will have to ask the permission of Great Britain.

This is language which could not but be very palatable to the slave-holders in Congress assembled, by their slaveholding Speaker; but it ought to enlist the feelings of every British subject, every British Christian, in support of the noble-minded men who are standing forth in the United States, to resist the torrent of national iniquity. We call upon the country to give its voice. Trust not to the smooth words of slow movements of Lord Palmerston. It will be seen from our Parliamentary record, that on Tuesday night, the subject of what the papers call the *Result in Texas* was mooted in the House of Commons. In answer to the question, whether the Government had received any communication relative to the establishment of slavery and the trade in Texas, Lord Palmerston observed, that the inhabitants of Texas were in revolt against the Mexican Government, and that, if they succeeded, in such case the laws of Mexico could not be applied. Was this a reply worthy of a British statesman? Mr. H.oy announced his intention of bringing the subject under the consideration of Parliament; and we will take care that the subject shall not be stifled. Dr. Lushington asked, whether Government had received any information of the importation of slaves from Texas into the United States? Was the honorable and learned gentleman content with the answer which he obtained? We are sure he was not.

#### THE BAPTISTS IN AMERICA.

As our readers are probably aware, is the title of the volume which since their return to England, Mr. Cox and Holy have published about their American visit. In it they attempt to vindicate their course in reference to the subject of Slavery and emancipation, while in this country. At the meeting of the Baptist Union, of which some notice was taken in our number, they were present, and in set speeches repeated the same attempt. Their success may be judged in part, from the extracts published last week from a review of their volume, copied on the last page of our present number, from the Birmingham Philanthropist.

To the evidence which these extracts furnish, we add the following paragraph of a letter recently received from Mr. John Seoble, Secretary of the British Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

The Rev. Delegates have not, in the estimation of our brethren, justified their policy on the Anti-Slavery question when among you. They are severely censured in the resolutions just past by the Baptist Union, were severely chastised in the speeches which those resolutions were accompanied, and are considered by the public generally as having failed in the discharge of the duty they were expected to perform to the sacred cause of Negro Emancipation. Hereafter I will inform you of the steps taken by our Committee, in this matter, and the decision to which I expect they will arrive.

By the same arrival which brought us Mr. Seoble's letter, we received among other valuable publications a copy of a letter addressed to the Rev. Doctors, by Thomas Willcocks, a brother clergyman, of who we have their own denomination. In this he refers to a circular letter from the Committee of the Baptist Union, to the Pastors and members of the Baptist Union throughout the country, and adds,

"Between a certain part of this document, fairly interpreted, and your own statements in the 'Baptists in America,' there is a marked discrepancy." He then quotes from the volume, an assertion that the delegates were left "entirely free" to pursue what course they thought proper in relation to emancipation and the condition, civil and religious, of the colored population, placing at the same time, in a parallel column, this passage from the circular.

"We send our deputation to promote most zealously, and to the utmost of their ability, in the spirit of love, devotion, and fidelity, but still most zealously, to promote the sacred cause of Negro emancipation."

Near the conclusion of his letter, Mr. Willcocks says,

"I give you credit for having appeared as abolitionists separate companies; but I blame you, I must decide to blame you, for shrinking from the performance of the public duty which devolved upon you in that character. I cherish a momentary persuasion, that you have unintentionally injured the sacred cause of emancipation in America, and misrepresented the English Baptist churches to the triennial convention."

We subjoin an extract from a review of the 'Baptists in America,' in the London Evangelical Magazine for June 1836.

"We beg, then, to state, at once, that we are by no means satisfied with the defence which the deputation have made of their own line of policy. If they are convinced in their minds—and only they must be—that the American Christians, and particularly their own denomination, are living in a frightful sin against God, it was their duty to enter into no compromise with that sin, and to make no conditions of abstinence from denouncing it in the same frank, open, and manly way in which they would have denounced it in their native country. If their so acting would indeed have prevented them from sharing the confidence of the American Baptists, it would have been a noble act of Christian heroism to have forfeited a confidence which could not be secured without merging the identity of their character upon a paramount question in Christian morals; and the deputation returned to England under such circumstances, without effecting the objects of their mission, they would have been hailed with acclamation by every friend of liberty, while the American churches would have learnt a lesson never to be forgotten, that British Christians cannot consistently with their obligations to the great Master, make common cause with American professors of the Gospel in their slaveholding propensities."

We do not admit for a moment that slavery in America, as far as Christians are concerned, is ever can be a mere political question. It is just as little so in America as it was in England. We do not, indeed, hold the Christians in America responsible for the abolition of Slavery. They may not be able to abolish it; but we do hold them responsible for two things; first, for an unequivocal protest against its dreadful iniquity; and secondly, for clearing their own hands of the accursed thing. The difference between America and England in the question of slavery appears to us to be simply this;—that in our country slavery has been, for many years past the *sin chiefly of the church as of the world*. Here the faithful ministers of the cross have ever denounced it; there the great body of evangelical men have either defended it or kept silence on it. Here the Christian press—by which we mean that portion of it which has been under the direction of spiritual men—has called, as with one voice, for its abolition; there it has stigmatized the men who

may be fairly regarded as the Granville Sharps, the Wilberforces, and the Buxtons of the New World. In such a state of things are the Christian pastors of England, when they land on American shores, to weaken the hands of the abolitionists, who have to contend as fiercely with the church as with the world? Are they to treat that as *politics* in America which they would call *morals* in England? Are they to keep silence on the subject of slavery as the tacit condition of their speaking out on revivals and on Christian missions? Are they to purchase the applause of the timid, the irresolute, and the actually corrupt, by standing aloof from that persecuted but noble band of men who call the sin of slavery by its proper name, and who demand its immediate abolition, as an equal infringement of the law of God and of the principles of a Republic boasting more of its liberty than any other nation under the face of heaven? We say, unhesitatingly, that English pastors will unspokeably degrade themselves, and violate principles which ought to be dearer to them than existence itself, if they will allow themselves to be placed in such an ominous position. Much as we approve of deputations to America, we do not think that any benefit they could confer would equal the sacrifice of great principles which would be involved, to the honor and integrity of our churches, in visits conducted upon the cowardly and unworthy principle of shutting the mouths of English pastors upon the crying sin of the American churches.

#### THE SLAVE CASE.

The important slave case of which our last number contained a very brief notice, was decided on Saturday last, in favor of the applicant for freedom. A more detailed account than we had time to prepare last week, will doubtless be acceptable to our readers.

A Mrs. Slater came from New Orleans in the early part of the season, on a visit to her father, Mr. Thomas Aves of this city, and brought with her a young girl, by the laws of Louisiana, the property of her husband. While temporarily absent from the city, Mrs. S. left the child with Mr. Aves, intending, when the term of her visit should have expired, to carry her back to New Orleans and there retain her as a slave. The facts being known, a writ of habeas corpus was procured, and Mr. Aves was brought up to answer for his detention of the girl, and in the return which by his counsel he made to the writ, the facts as above stated, were set forth, and the claim set up, that a person coming from a State where slavery is legal, and bringing slaves with him, not with the purpose of remaining permanently, but merely on a transient visit, has a right to carry his slaves back with him, and in the mean time to restrain them of their liberty so far as is necessary to secure the attainment of that object.

The cause came before Judge Wilde, on Thursday, the 18th ult., and was argued by Ellis G. Loring and Samuel E. Sewall Esqrs. on behalf of the petitioner, and C. P. and B. R. Curtis Esqrs. for the respondent, and was deferred till Friday, the 26th, for the advice of the other Judges. On that day it was re-argued with much ability before all the Judges, by Messrs. Loring and Choate for the petitioner, and by the same gentlemen as on the former occasion for Mr. Aves. The argument occupied the whole day, from 9 A.M. till nearly 7 P.M. with the exception of an hour and a half recess for dinner. From our notes taken at the time we shall present an outline of the arguments of counsel, and from other sources, the opinion of the court, on the points controverted.

Mr. Loring first made a statement of the evidence, which was presented at the former hearing, and which merely proved the facts already stated.

Mr. B. R. Curtis then proceeded to open the case. He remarked that he should confine himself to the first of the three points made at the former hearing, the second being a necessary corollary of the first, and the third being untenable. He then stated the following, as the proposition which he should endeavor to maintain.

*A citizen of a slave State, who comes to Massachusetts for temporary purposes of business or pleasure, and brings a slave as a personal attendant on his journey, may restrain that slave for the purpose of carrying him out of the State and returning him to the domicile of his owner.*

The considerations, said Mr. C. on which I expect to maintain this proposition, grow out of the laws of Louisiana.

First, then, by the laws of Louisiana, the girl is a slave. No matter what she is by the laws of Massachusetts while here, is she so emancipated, as that she would be free on her return to Louisiana? That she is not, I refer to authorities. 14, Martin's Reports 105. A case in which the question was, whether a slave by being taken to the North West Territory, became free. It was decided that he did, because the master was domiciled there, and had no intention of returning. 2d Marshall's Ky. Reports, 467. Here it was decided, in regard to two slaves, the master of one of whom was domiciled in the N. W. Territory, and of the other was there transiently, that the former was free, and the latter was not. But the leading case is in 2d of Haggard's admiralty Rep. 94, in which Lord Stowell decided that Grace, a female slave who went from the West Indies to England, and there became free while remaining in England, on her return to the West Indies, was again a slave.—The power of the master, which in England was extinct, revived on her return to a slave country. It is well settled law then, that the child in this case, is still a slave, by the law of Louisiana.

Second, what effect have the laws of Louisiana, in this Commonwealth?

1. The general principles of international law are broad enough to cover this case, unless, it furnishes an exception to general rules. Slaves are regarded in two lights, as persons and as property.

First as persons. It is a maxim of law that the condition accompanies the person. See Story's conflict of laws, 64. "Qualitas personam sicut umbra sequitur." In the case of Potter & Brown, 5 East, 124. Lord Ellenborough decided that 'we import together with their persons, the existing relations of foreigners as between themselves, according to the laws of their respective countries.'

Second, as property. I refer to Story's Conflict of laws, 313. [Mr. Curtis here read an extract from the work referred to, in which Potier is quoted as having laid it down as the rule of the civil law, that movable property is governed by the law of the owner's domicile. He also referred to Vattel's law of nations, 165 and 174, to show that according to that author, the property of the individual is the property of the State of which he is a citizen.] 'These,' continued Mr. C. 'mean something more than to regulate the succession or transfer of property. They mean that a right of property existing in one State is not destroyed by carrying the subject of it into another State. See Story's Conflict of laws, 304—6. The general principle is broad enough for our purpose unless this be an exception.

To settle this question, this court is fully competent. No legislation in regard to it is needed. It

may be contended on the other side, that the court has not this power. To establish our position that it has, I refer to Story's Conflict of laws, 37 and 25. He is here considering how the rule, as to the admission of the laws of foreign nations is to be promulgated, whether by the court or by the legislature. [We omit the extracts on account of their length. The substance of them is, that the courts of Europe and America have hitherto exercised the authority of determining what operation foreign laws shall have within their jurisdiction.] Lord Stowell, in 2d Consistory Rep. 59, in regard to a marriage in Scotland, remarked that 'the only principle applicable to such a case by the law of England is, that the validity of the marriage rights must be tried by reference to the law of the country where they had their origin.' In the case of Blanchard vs. Russell, 13 Mass. Rep. 6, it was decided that questions as to the conflicting laws of different States, are to be settled by judicial authority. It is therefore settled that it is the province of this court to decide whether any, and if any, what effect must be given here to the law of Louisiana.

We can hardly hope to find authorities which will cover this case. We must, therefore, be guided by general principles, and it is important to inquire if there are any rules applicable to the case.

1. The courts will be guided by the relations which the other country sustains to theirs. On this point I refer to Story's conflict of laws, 25. 27. Also to the case of the King against Ball, reported in the first volume of the American Jurist, 297. The point there decided was, that a thief escaping from Vermont to Canada, should be delivered on demand, to the authorities of Vermont.

The same rule may be fairly deduced from the exceptions to the general rule. I now ask attention to these exceptions. These are first, where the admission of the foreign law would work injury to the State or its citizens, or second, where it is immoral.—See Story's Conflict of laws, 95. Chief Justice Parsons, in Greenwood vs. Curtis, 6 Mass. Rep. 378, states the exceptions in terms a little different, but the same in substance. The first exception he gives verbatim as I have stated it. The second is when giving effect to the foreign law would exhibit to the citizens of the State, an example pernicious and detestable.

Will it then, I first enquire, work injury to the State or its citizens, to allow a master coming here for a temporary purpose, to bring his slave with him, and on his return, to carry him away?

1. It will be a violation of no public law of the State. The only express law on the subject, is that which forbids kidnapping. Rev. St. Ch. 125. Sec. 20. p. 781. That provides that no person shall 'without lawful authority, forcibly or secretly confine or imprison any other person within this State, or forcibly carry or send any such person out of this State,' &c. It does not attempt to define the lawful authority. Its evident intention is the punishment of an unlawful act, not to limit or define what act is unlawful.

2. It is no direct injury to the citizen, for it has no direct effect on the citizen. It effects only the stranger. I exclude here the question of immorality, which I shall consider hereafter. It may be objected that it would be contrary to the public policy, to admit such recognition of the foreign law. But it should be borne in mind, in considering this question, that we are now dealing with the policy of Mass. towards the other States,—not toward her own citizens. I feel incompetent to take the range which here lies before me. The court will, must consider how far slavery entered into the policy of those States, and the relations they sustain to us. With these suggestions, I leave it in the hands of the court. I will say the court must make a marked distinction between the case of a foreigner, and a person from one of our sister States. When Somerset's case is urged, it must be considered that it was the case of a citizen of Virginia, a dependent colony, and very different from that of a citizen of an independent State. I will add a few considerations on this point.

It is necessary to look at home, and not abroad—at the relations of our own—not of foreign States. A guide for the court in this case, is furnished in the Constitution of the United States. Before proceeding to consider it, I would remark that the existence of positive laws in regard to this subject in some States, furnishes no ground for argument in regard to it where such positive laws do not exist.

One other consideration. It will be perhaps urged on the other side, that the provision of the Constitution was inserted against our will, and is contrary to our policy. I answer, its insertion was just as much the free act of Massachusetts, as of Louisiana. It might have been for different reasons, on our part, but still it was our free act. It has been adopted into our supreme law, it cannot therefore be said to be contrary to our policy.

Next. The Constitution having provided for but one class of cases, furnishes no argument against the application of the principle to other classes of cases. One class was particularly provided for, because it was the most important class, because it was a class easily defined, and because it was one which required the active intervention of the law. It was therefore very proper to insert it. But this case requires no active intervention of law—it is thus distinguished from the class specified in the Constitution. Another reason for the omission might be, that the slave States—not unwisely,—thought if the case of fugitives were provided for, other cases might be left to the good feeling and comity of the States. Not unwisely I say, for several of the States have gone a step beyond the Constitution and provided by legislative enactment, for the very case now before the court. I refer to the N. Y. Revised laws, 6, and to the public Statutes of R. I. and Pa. This proves that such provision is not against the policy of these States. Why should the public policy of Mass. be different from that of New York, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania?

No argument against us is to be drawn from these acts of Legislature, for it was only when the Legislature has regulated slavery—prohibiting, generally, the introduction of slaves into the state, that the exception became necessary, to meet the particular case of persons coming in for temporary purposes. Here we have no positive enactment, therefore there is no need of an exception in the statute, but it grows out of comity between the states. I am not able to find any case where a state has legislated on the subject, and prohibited the introduction of slaves, without at the same time making this exception. See N. Y. Revised Laws, 6. Laws of R. I. 607. (St. 1798.) Laws of Pa. Digest, 651. Laws of N. J. 679. (1820, St. 21.)

It will probably be urged on the other side, that though our claim is limited to the bare removal of the slave, and extends not to any right of exercising an owner's power over him, this cannot be done on any principle. If we allow the master any of that power with which the laws of his own state invest him, we

must allow him all. There can be no limit. If he be permitted to remove the slave, he may compel him to labor—may treat him in all respects as his property, and thus slavery will be introduced into Massachusetts.

I answer, first, there is no practical difficulty. The constitution has provided for a similar case, and laws of several states for identically the same, and no difficulty has yet arisen from the operation of these provisions.

Second, I ask, is there any theoretical difficulty?—Not to refer again to the constitution, the law of England has settled that the objection is not well founded. Lord Mansfield indeed says, in Somerset's case, that 'the difficulty of adopting the relation, without adopting it in all its consequences, is extreme,' but its impossibility is not even there made out as a principle of law.

Decisions of the English Courts since Lord Mansfield, show that no such difficulty exists. 1. Aton's Rep. 240. 1. Dodson, 81 and 95. 2. Dodson, 219. They decide that where citizens of a country which has prohibited the slave trade, are found engaged in that trade, and slaves are captured from them and carried to the West Indies, the court will not restore the slaves; but where slaves are taken from the citizens of a country which has not prohibited that trade, the laws of Great Britain will give effect to the relation, as to the claim of property, and will restore the slaves to the claimant, because of the foreign law. 3. Barnwell & Alderson, 353. Prior to this, England had abolished the slave trade. Here was a direct recognition of the master's right of property, and yet I presume the King's Bench did not think it introduced slavery into England, with all its incidents.

I refer also to Story's Conflict of Laws, 24. 'A state may prohibit the operation of all foreign laws within its own territories. It may prohibit some and admit the operation of others. It may recognize, and modify, and qualify some foreign laws; it may enlarge, or give universal effect to others.' The same author says, as we have already shown, that by the common law of England, the courts have this power to modify and qualify the foreign law. As an analogous case, I refer again to the King vs. Ball, cited in 1 Kent, 36. Suppose, when Vermont demanded the fugitive from justice in that case, the Governor of Canada had replied, 'The right to do one thing, carries with it the right to do all things, in relation to the subject. If you have a right to take the fugitive and carry him out of the province, or to restrain him for that purpose, you have a right to try him, to convict, sentence, execute him within the province.' The case would be analogous. But an objection to giving up the criminal, founded on such reasoning, would not be deemed valid. On the principles of law, and by the comity of nations the law of Vermont ought to be recognized so far as to give a right to carry the fugitive back within the jurisdiction of the State courts. So here. The child is held to labor by the law of Louisiana, and not of Massachusetts, and we only ask that she be put under the operation of the law of her master's domicile, so far as to enable him to retain the custody of her, and remove her to the place from which she was brought.

Will it be said that great danger to the institutions of this Commonwealth, will ensue from allowing even this qualified right in the master? There is no need for us to speculate upon this point, though we might know from the habits of thought and feeling among us, that such danger is unreal. Public opinion is too strong against slavery, to leave room for such apprehension. But I repeat we have no need of speculation. We can point to the examples of those states which have enacted laws in reference to this matter, and in which no evil consequences have followed. No injury to the institutions of those states has resulted from these laws, nor have the opinions of their people been drawn toward slavery.

I have now gone through the first part of my argument, and have shown that it belongs to the court to decide what operation the law of Louisiana shall have in this state, and that effect can be given to that law, without injury to this state or its citizens. If the court can give it effect, and without injury, it only remains to inquire whether it is immoral.

Before speaking on this point, I would say—what is perhaps unnecessary—that I am no advocate of the right—the natural right of the master to his slave. What I say is drawn from legal considerations, for I do not believe in the natural right of slavery. But the question now is whether, in the view of the law, slavery is immoral. Morality or immorality in a court of law, must be decided by law, not by what moralists think, or what your honors, as men, think, of the moral quality of an act. What is legal is moral. See 2. Dodson 249 and 10 Wheaton, 121. (Mr. Curtis here read extracts from these cases, going to establish his proposition.) It is well settled then, that by a court of law, morality is to be tried by a legal standard. Of course, whether slavery is immoral, must be decided by ascertaining whether it is so by law.

1. It is not immoral by the law of England. See 3 Barnwell and Alderson 353, already cited. It is a well known maxim of law, that the law will not aid the wrong doer, or enforce a claim founded on an immoral transaction. But in this case the court did aid the slaveholder, and sustain his claim to the value of the slaves of which he had been deprived. Of course the court conceived that he had a moral right to them, according to law. See also, 1 Mason, 45. In this case it was decided that the master's claim to the wages of a slave let as a mariner and discharged abroad, was valid. How could Judge Story have given effect to the relation of slavery, so as to sustain the master's claim to the earnings of the slave, if slavery be immoral by law? If the plaintiff had founded his claim on a transaction, which the law regards as immoral, could he have recovered? But here he was allowed to recover, though his claim was made through slavery. Of course slavery is not in the legal sense immoral.

2. It is not immoral by the law of this state, for it is recognised by the supreme law of the land, the Constitution of the United States. How can this court pronounce slavery immoral, when before you rise from your seats, you may be required to sign a warrant for taking back a slave to the state from which he has escaped? Such is the supreme law, and whether we approve or deplore it, there it is. The Constitution of the country recognises and protects slavery, and requires our courts to assist the master in recovering his fugitive slaves: how then can slavery be in the eye of the law, immoral? Chief Justice Parker, in case of Commonwealth vs. Griffiths, says, 'the words of the Constitution were used out of delicacy, so as not to offend some in the convention whose feelings were abhorrent to slavery; but we there entered into an agreement that slaves should be considered as property.' 2. Pick. Rep. 19.

I will now refer to some authorities bearing directly on this case. The great and leading case, and that which will doubtless be relied on, on the other side, is Somerset's case, decided by Lord Mansfield,

in 1771. I shall not say that Somerset's case has not settled the law of England—I believe it has; but I look at the opinion of Sir William Scott, in the case of the slave Grace, 2. Haggard's Reports, as an able comment on Somerset's case, and as showing that the circumstances of that case were of such a nature, that it ought not to govern us.

Few reasons are given by the learned Judge, from which we can gather the exact grounds on which he decided the case. Some of those which he stated in giving his opinion, I will present, to show that it is not applicable to us. (Mr. Curtis here quoted from Lord Mansfield's opinion, the proposition, that 'nothing can be suffered to support slavery, but positive law.') Now if by 'positive law,' he means an act of the legislature, this is not true. Slavery has no where been introduced by the Legislature, except perhaps in some of the Spanish colonies. It has uniformly been introduced by custom. If he means that it does not exist without some law, either statute or custom, it is unquestionably true. If he means that it could not without a positive law of the country where the question is tried, regardless of that of the master's domicile, it is not true. The case in Barnwell and Alderson 353, goes directly against such a proposition. There a right growing out of slavery and the slave trade was recognised by the court, though the law of England did not permit the existence of slavery in that country, and the slave trade, had been abolished, by its Legislature.

In another part of his opinion on the case of Somerset, Lord Mansfield says, 'a contract for the sale of a slave is good here; the sale is a matter to which the law properly and readily attaches, and will maintain the price according to agreement. But here the person of the slave himself is immediately the object of inquiry; which makes a very material difference.

Now I cannot perceive the distinction. Is not the contract for the sale of a slave, a contract relating to his person? How was it in the case of Madrazo vs. Willes? What but the persons of the slaves was there in question? The right to retain their persons as property?

I hope the court will bear in mind in regard to Somerset's case, at what time it was decided, and who were the parties before the court. It was in 1771, while Virginia was a colony of Great Britain. The claimant was a Virginian—a subject of the British empire. None of the considerations to which the attention of the court is now called, could then have been presented, for none of them existed. Had the counsel in that case spoken of 'national comity,' he would have been rebuked. 'Colonial policy' was the strongest term used. The admissibility of the 'Lex loci' was indeed discussed, but that considerations of 'national comity' were introduced in settling a question of the conflicting laws of the mother country, and a dependent colony, is impossible.

To show that this case is not to govern us, I will put a supposed case. Suppose that at the time of the union between England and Scotland, slavery had existed in Scotland, incorporated into all the institutions of that country, civil, political and domestic. Suppose that it had been recognized by the act of union and that provision had been made for the restoration of fugitive slaves. What would have been Lord Mansfield's decision if a Scottish gentleman, traveling in England, accompanied by a slave as a personal attendant, had been brought before the court to answer for a detention of the slave with the intention of carrying him home on his return? Should we not have heard something about the comity of nations, the importance of the interest in question to the sister kingdom and the necessity of maintaining kind feelings between the two nations? Would not the guarantee in the act of Union, and the laws for the defence of the master's claim have been considered? I submit whether he would have decided the case on the same grounds as he did that of Somerset.

I now refer to some other cases which have a direct bearing upon this. The Antelope, 10 Wheaton, 66. In this case a number of slaves had been taken from a Spanish vessel engaged in the slave trade and at length brought into a United States port. The Spanish consul claimed them for the owners, and the claim was allowed, and the slaves restored. [Mr. Curtis also cited again the case from 2 Marshall's Kentucky Reports, referred to on his first point.] A case is reported in the American Jurist, Vol. 3.—404 and onward, in which Judge Morris of Indiana decided that a citizen of Virginia, passing through Indiana with his slaves, on his way to Illinois with the purpose of settling there, could not hold the slaves, because he intended to remain permanently in a free state. In pronouncing this decision, the Judge intimated that a citizen of a slaveholding state would have a right to retain his slaves, if he were in a free state for a temporary purpose, as traveling for pleasure or business, or emigrating from one slave state to another, and passing through a free state on the journey.

Mr. Curtis here concluded with a few general remarks, and was followed by Mr. Loring, who in an argument clear, well arranged, logical and forcible—to us indeed it seemed irresistible—established the proposition that a slave brought into this state by the voluntary act of the master, becomes immediately free, and that of course the child in this case was illegally detained. We shall give an outline of his argument next week.

#### ANTI-SLAVERY IN FRANCE.

The cause of impartial liberty is receiving the attention of the benevolent in France, and a public sentiment is forming there, which will ere long sweep the detestable institution from all the colonies of that country, in which it at present finds a habitation. Among the recent publications which a late arrival from England brought us, is a French pamphlet published in Paris, entitled 'AN APPEAL FROM THE CAPITAL OF SCOTLAND, TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ON THE SUBJECT OF SLAVERY. Translated from the English.' An advertisement attached to it, notices five other Anti-Slavery works, for sale by the same Publisher whose name is affixed to this.

We would thank the person who a few days since borrowed from our office, on his own responsibility, a copy of the Birmingham Philanthropist, to return the same without delay. Its absence has already subjected us to some inconvenience, as it contained matter which we had designed for this week's paper. We are of course very happy on all occasions to oblige people with the loan of anything we have, but really should prefer to be allowed the privilege of deciding for ourselves, what we will lend, and when we will lend—or at least of knowing when we have lent an article which we may happen to want, so as to be saved the trouble of searching the whole office over for it.

#### NOTICE.

Mr. Nathaniel Billings is appointed my agent to obtain subscribers in this city and vicinity, for the first Volume of the Liberator. Boston, Sept. 3. RAY POTTER.



## LITERARY.

[For the Liberator.]

## TO THE DAUGHTERS OF JAMES FORTEN, PHILADELPHIA.

Sisters!—the vain and proud may pass ye by  
With the rude taunt and cold malicious eye  
Point the pale hand deridingly and slow,  
In scorn's vile gesture at the darker brow;  
Curl the pressed lip with sneers which might besit  
Some mocking spirit from the nether pit;  
Yet, from a heart, whence Truth and Love have borne  
The last remains of Prejudice and Scorn—  
From a warm heart, which, thanks to God, hath felt  
Pride's chain to loosen, and its iron melt—  
Fervent and pure let this frail tribute bear  
A brother's blessing with a brother's prayer.

And what, my sisters, though upon your brows  
The deeper coloring of your kindred glows,  
Shall I less love the workmanship of Him  
Before whose wisdom all our own is dim?  
Shall my heart learn to graduate its thrill?  
Beat for the white, and for the black be still?  
Let the thought perish—while that heart can feel  
The blessed memory of your grateful zeal—  
While it can prize the excellence of mind,  
The chaste demeanor and the taste refined,  
Still are ye all my sisters—meet to share  
A brother's blessing and a brother's prayer!  
7th of 12th mo., 1836. J. G. W.

[From the New Monthly Magazine.]

## TWENTY YEARS.

BY THOMAS HAYNES BAYLEY.

They tell me twenty years have pass'd  
Since I have looked upon thee last,  
And thought thee fairest of the fair,  
With thy sylph-like form and light-brown hair!  
I can remember every word  
That from those smiling lips I heard;  
Oh! how little it appears  
Like the lapse of twenty years!

Thou art changed! in thee I find  
Beauty of another kind;  
Those rich curls lie on thy brow  
In a darker cluster now;  
And the sylph-like form given place  
To the matron's form of grace—  
Yet how little it appears  
Like the lapse of twenty years!

Still thy cheek is round and fair;  
Mid thy curls not one grey hair;  
Not one lurking sorrow lies  
In the lustre of those eyes;  
Thou hast felt, since last we met,  
No affliction, no regret!  
Wonderful! to shed no tears  
In the lapse of twenty years!

But what means that changing brow?  
Tears are in those dark eyes now!  
Have my rash, incautious words  
Waken'd feelings of slumbering chords?  
Wherefore dost thou bid me look  
At yon dark-bound journal book?  
There the register appears  
Of the lapse of twenty years!

Thou hast been a happy bride,  
Kneeling by a lover's side;  
And unclouded was thy life,  
As his loved and loving wife;  
Thou hast worn the garb of gloom,  
Kneeling by that husband's tomb;  
Thou hast wept a widow's tears  
In the lapse of twenty years!

Oh! I see my error now,  
To suppose, in cheek and brow,  
Strangers may presume to find  
Treasured secrets of the mind:  
There fond Memory still will keep  
Her vigil, when she seems to sleep;  
Though composure re-appears  
In the lapse of twenty years!

Where's the hope that can abate  
The grief of hearts thus desolate?  
That can Youth's keenest pangs assuage,  
And mitigate the gloom of Age?  
Religion bids the tempest cease,  
And leads her to a port of peace;  
And on the lonely pilot steers  
Through the lapse of future years!

## ON A FRIEND LOST AT SEA.

BY GEORGE D. PRENTICE.

Sleep on—sleep on—above thy corse  
The winds their sabbath keep,  
The wave sweeps round thee, and thy breast  
Heaves with the heaving deep;  
Here the mild Eve her beauty flings,  
And there the white gull lifts her wings,  
And the blue halcyon loves to lave  
Her plumage in the holy wave.

Sleep on—no willow o'er thee bends  
With melancholy air,  
No violet springs, nor dewy rose  
Its soul of love lays bare,  
But there the sea-flower bright and young  
Is sweetly o'er thy slumbers flung,  
And like weeping mourner fair,  
The pale flag hangs its tresses there.

Sleep on—sleep on—the jewelry  
Of Ocean's coral caves  
Is now thine urn—thy requiem  
The music of its waves;  
Through thy dark locks the sea gems gleam  
Bright emblem of thy spirit's dream,  
And pure and deep as infant love  
The blue sea rolls its waves above.

Sleep on—sleep on—the fearful wrath  
Of mingling cloud and deep  
May leave its deep and stormy track  
Above thy place of sleep;  
But, when the wave has sunk to rest;  
As now, 'twill murmur o'er thy breast,  
And the bright victims of the sea  
Perchance will make their home with thee.

Sleep on—thy corse is far away,  
But grief bewails thee yet,  
For thee the heart-wrung sigh is breathed,  
And lovely eyes are wet;  
And she thy young and beautiful bride—  
Her thoughts are hovering by thy side—  
As oft she turns to view with tears  
The Eden of departed years.

## THE TIMES.

In these unhappy times and dying days  
Of this now dying world, when good decays,  
Love's quite extinct, and virtue's held a scorn!  
When such are only priz'd by wretched ways  
Who with a golden fleece them can adorn!  
When avarice and lust are counted praise,  
And bravest minds live, orphan-like, forlorn!

## MISCELLANEOUS.

## WHAT HAVE ABOLITIONISTS NOT DONE?

The 'Voice of Freedom' publishes the following propositions in regard to what Abolitionists have not done:—

1. They have not invoked the genius of mobocracy to give efficiency to their arguments and operations or paralyze those of their opponents.
2. They have not burned incense to this fell spirit, by a compromise of rights and law at his bidding, as in the commitment of Mr. Garrison to prison, and the arrest of Mr. Storrs while engaged in prayer.
3. They have not elected Judge Lynch, the Moloch of modern times, to defend their cause and immolate such as might obstruct their progress.
4. They have not instigated insurrections and servile war; for they have neither held nor published doctrines of any such character or tendency; nor have they sent any doctrines to the slaves; nor is it their concern to operate on the slaves at all, but on the master.

5. The abolitionists have not "thrown back emancipation fifty years," for it has never been forward in our country, so as to render this possible. And it is a fact of unquestionable notoriety, that their efforts in other countries, have been hailed in a spirit of sympathy and cordiality equally marked, delightful and encouraging to their hearts.

6. They have never attempted interference with State legislation or constitutional prerogatives, having clearly defined and protested against such interference from the beginning of their efforts.

7. They have not "made the condition of the slaves worse"—having only asked that it should be made better than before.

8. Nor have they "slandered the South and the country," inasmuch as from Southern testimony alone, all their allegations respecting slavery are fully substantiated.

9. Nor have abolitionists "alienated the South." We aver, that all the pretended attachment hitherto maintained, and now said to be sundered by their efforts, was spurious—a mere mockery—the bastard progeny of mercenary interest and aristocratic corruptions. And we adduce in proof, the dissolution and disappearance of the attachment, on the groundless charge of intermeddling with their "domestic institutions."

10. Nor have they "endangered the union and institutions of the country"—inasmuch as facts have proved, that there was no real union between the South and the North, but that slavery had already dissolved it; and besides the abolition of slavery is the sine qua non, for the restoration and cementing of those ties, which of old bound the country together. And it is demonstrable, to the most ordinary apprehensions, that free institutions can never be endangered, but must be effectually secured by removing the bilge-rotten forces—the conflicting elements of slavery from among them.

11. Finally they have not "meddled with matters foreign to their appropriate business." So far from it, their efforts have produced the most abundant and melancholy proof, that slavery has sent its deadly influence throughout the land, polluting, even at the North, our sanctuaries—poisoning our associations—prostrating our laws—stupefying the moral sense of the community, and bringing into peril all that we hold most dear. If, to this, abolitionists were to add, that in whatever interests humanity affects them as men, that they are under a solemn injunction from Jesus Christ to send the gospel to every creature, even the slave, from whom slavery withholds it, and that as citizens, they are affected by whatever involves the happiness or ruin of their fellow citizens, their vindication would be complete. So much then, for what abolitionists have not done.

## A VIRGINIAN'S OPINION OF THE EFFECTS OF SLAVERY.

We copy the following eloquent extract from the speech of Mr. Faulkner, in the Virginia Legislature, in 1832. It is a bold, frank and honorable avowal of the turpitude of slavery, from one who abides in its very midst, and whose testimony therefore is entitled to credit, as that of an eye witness. It proves, too, that however southerners may disguise their real sentiments on this subject, its true character and influence is felt and acknowledged, even among themselves.—Without further comment, we ask for it the candid perusal of our readers.—*Franklin Freeman.*

MR. FAULKNER said:—Sir, I am gratified to perceive that no gentleman has yet risen in this hall the avowed advocate of slavery. The day has gone by, when such a voice could be listened to with patience or even forbearance. I even regret, Sir, that we should find one among us, who enters the lists as its apologist, except on the ground of uncontrollable necessity. If there be one who concurs with the gentleman from Brunswick (Mr. Gholson) in the harmless character of this institution, let me request him to compare the condition of the slaveholding portion of this Commonwealth—barren, d-solate, and seared, as it were by the avenging hand of Heaven, with the descriptions which we have of the same country from those who first broke its virgin soil. To what is this change ascribable? Alone, to the withering and blasting effects of slavery. If this does not satisfy him, let me request him to extend his travels to the northern states of this Union—and beg him to contrast the happiness and contentment which prevails throughout the country—the busy and cheerful sound of industry—the rapid and swelling growth of their population—means and institutions of education—their skill and proficiency in the useful arts—their enterprise and public spirit—the monuments of their commercial and manufacturing industry; and above all, their devoted attachment to the government from which they derive their protection, with the division, discontent, indolence and poverty of the southern country. To what, sir, is all this ascribable? To that vice in the organization of society by which one half of its inhabitants are arrayed in interest and feelings against the other half—to that unfortunate state of society in which freemen regard labor as disgraceful, and slaves shrink from it as a burden tyrannically imposed upon them—to that condition of things in which half a million of your population can feel no sympathy with society in the prosperity of which they are forbidden to participate—no attachment to a government at whose hands they receive nothing but injustice!

Temperance in Franconia.—A writer in the Temperance Journal for July, relates the following pleasing facts respecting the Iron Works at Franconia, N. H.—"Of the fifty men employed about said works, not more than two (if any) of them drank any ardent spirit. A few weeks since they all drank it, and believed they could not do without it, because their work was so laborious, and so heating—but now the whole scene is changed; the workmen state that they never enjoyed better health, were never so well able to do their work; and what is of great consequence to relate, they formerly were poor, their families were wretched, and that at the settlement every year with the agent, they were in debt and miserable. But now no families look and live better and they always have money beforehand. One who, five years since, was in debt five hundred dollars, has paid the same from his earnings, has cash on hand, and adds thereto every month. So much for cold water."

## TURKISH MATRIMONIAL MAXIMS.

1. Obey your husband; for he is your lawful master. He has paid your price, and made you presents; therefore he is your sultan. His right arm is your protection, and the edge of his sword if need be, your punishment.

2. Love your husband, if you possibly can; if you cannot, do not hate him; for it is your duty to cherish and make much of him.

3. Be ever mindful of the respect you owe him; for he is your lord. Salute him in the morning, with a respectful greeting; and when you present your first pipe to him, kiss his hand and bend your knee, and sit not in his presence, till he has twice desired you to be seated.

4. When you quarrel with the other women, do it behind his back; and if they rival you in his favor, do not let him see your jealousy; for jealous wives are always hated. If he smile on the slaves while you are rubbing his feet, still do it gently, and let him not feel that you are weary of pleasing him.

5. Remember your face was made for your husband, therefore let no human being but him behold it. It is only the Christian women, who have no shame, that are inconsistent enough to cover their necks, and show their features.

6. If your husband be old, it is needless to plague him. Pray to the Apostle to give you patience; and though you are entitled to more recreation than other women, do not frequent the bath\* too much till the good man has made his will.

7. If a foolish Effendi throw a sunbul in your path, do not pick it up, nor tell your slave to do so—but slaves will pick up flowers, and bath-women will convey insolent love-letters in cloths and charcoal. A discreet woman should never be accused of receiving any of these communications.

8. Let your own breast be the depository of your own secrets; and if possible, of your husband's also. The more you know of his secrets, the more power you have over him; the less he knows of yours, the smaller is the risk of your confidence being abused.

9. If your husband beat you, lift the roof of the house with the loudness of your screams. If this fail to collect the rabble, and shame your husband, shout from the windows till the guard and firemen fill the house, and refuse to go till they are paid for their trouble.

\*The bath is a famous place for scandalous assignments in Turkey.

## NEWSPAPERS.

Mr. Brooks, in one of his late letters from Europe, thus speaks:

"Newspapers are precious and scarce.—The postage is immense. A stray Galignani (an English newspaper printed in Paris) may now and then be seen, and the sight of one is a precious treasure; but almost all I learn from the United States is in the little journals of Italy, which are about as large as one-eighth part of the National Intelligencer of Washington. They tell me, the Union is breaking up; that riots and rows are desolating the whole land; that the slaves are rebelling, and that a servile war is threatened. And they rejoice loudly, as they hold up this mad demonstration of the folly of men attempting to govern themselves. Nothing so much delights them as this last demonstration, as they call it, of the impossibility of a republic, even when founded under the most favorable circumstances. The Lynch laws particularly delight them. The Mississippi gamblers, lynched as they were are nevertheless compensated with an immortality in every despot's journal in Europe. The slave missionaries are wearing a crown of glory here, as martyrs of a mad democracy. How true all these things are, I have no means of telling; for all I see is in the little Italian journals which are particularly occupied with such of our affairs as tend to discredit all republican institutions. And, perhaps, one of the greatest pleasures of travelling is to read such news of one's country in a foreign land, particularly when it is probable that all is at least founded on fact. The Emperor of Austria, it is said, has seized this occasion to inspire his Italian subjects with a horror of all republican institutions, by making it optional with some State prisoners in Italy—whether they will choose the punishment of death at home, or banishment to the United States!"

[From the Birmingham Philanthropist of June 30.]

## AMERICAN SLAVERY.

The Glasgow Discussion. Messrs. Cox and Hoby and the Baptist Union.

The discussion goes on gloriously for Mr. Thompson. Mr. BRECKINRIDGE's special pleadings, insinuations, and sophisms, receive from Mr. T. such complete and overpowering detection and confutation directly he opens his mouth, that we are surprised Mr. B. can risk the continuance of the discussion. The vile system of Slavery, and the equally vile prejudice of 'white aristocracy' has so debased his mind, that he is unable to reason for an instant without showing the 'darkness visible' of his soul. What a beautiful contrast Mr. THOMPSON presents to his opponent. He is all life, light, and beauty in his address. There is the power of truth and the charm of poetry about him. Mr. BRECKINRIDGE on the contrary, is grovelling, mean, wily, insinuating, involved, perplexed, and mazy as the error he is engaged to defend.

Messrs. Cox and Hoby. These gentlemen have made their defence before the Committee of the Baptist Union; and obtained a partial vote of thanks and a partial vote of censure. Dr. Cox's defence was sublimely ridiculous, Dr. Hoby's ridiculously sublime. The Union and they have smugged the thing up together, and with the exception of Mr. MURKILL, of Leicester, and Mr. PRICE, they have all of them sacrificed truth to expediency, and principle to union. The Patriot's report of the meeting is very extraordinary. It bears strong internal marks of unfaithful bias. We mean to have a touch at our contemporary for it. The Christian Advocate too, seems to have lost its usual consistency all at once. But we are forgetting that we Country Editors not having the privilege of the *entree* to the secrets of these matters cannot judge so fully as our brethren in London! There are suspicious indications of other pens having been at work in the offices of these Papers besides the Editors.

## ANECDOTE.

"A soft answer turneth away wrath."  
Madame de Genlis relates the following anecdote of her residence in Berlin:

"My saloon had two doors; one opening into my chamber, and the other conducting to a private staircase descending to the court; on the platform of this staircase was a door opposite to mine, belonging to the apartments of an emigrant. This man was of a savage disposition, and never saw any one in his house. Some one had given me two pots of beautiful hyacinths; at night I placed them on this platform between my neighbor's door and my own. In the morning I went to take them again, and had the disagreeable surprise to see my beautiful hyacinths cut in to pieces and scattered around the pots which held them; I easily guessed that my neighbor was the author of this deed, who had been excited to it, doubtless, notwithstanding his French politeness, by the libels which were published against me. Not wishing the affair to be known, I did not ask more flowers of the persons who

had given me these; but directed a servant to buy me some. Having placed these in the pots, I attached to them a slip of paper, on which I wrote these words—'Destroy my works if you will, but respect the works of God.' At night I placed them on the platform—in the morning I went with eagerness to see what had been their fate, and saw with great pleasure that some one had been content with simply watering them; I carried them immediately into the saloon, and placed them on the table, perceived that there were attached to them two silk strings, each having a charming cornelian ring. The emigrant, apparently, knew that I was then making a collection of *bijouterie*, and wished to repair his wrong, in this manner. I was much touched with this proceeding, which divested me of all rancor."

## TO THE PEOPLE OF COLOR THROUGHOUT NEW-ENGLAND.

FRIENDS:—The undersigned, a Committee of Delegates, assembled at Providence, appointed for the purpose, respectfully address to you the following brief review relative to the formation of a New-England Temperance Society of people of color. We have no doubt that you have seen, with heartfelt sorrow, the wretchedness and deep degradation under which very many of our colored brethren are now laboring, from their unhappy and ruinous love of intoxicating drinks. You, as well as we, would do your utmost to raise them from the mire of beastly indulgence. You will join with us in saying that a thorough reformation from their besetting vices must precede the success of any efforts to give a permanent elevation to their character. Every colored man laments the low and debased condition of his kind. Let us then rise in a body, and solemnly determine henceforth to put away the unclean thing from among us! We long to stand among the men of our country, as fellow-citizens, worthy of its country and the human race. Our first step is to put far away vice and every immorality. God will assist our endeavors, if made in the sincerity of true believers in his Gospel. We therefore cordially invite you to send delegates to a Convention proposed to be held at Boston, on the 26th day of October, 1836, for the purpose of taking into consideration the propriety of forming a New-England Temperance Society of People of Color.

Your friends and fellow-laborers in Christ.  
JOHN W. LEWIS, Jr.  
WINDSOR GARDNER, Providence.  
JAMES W. JOHNSON,  
CHARLES K. COOK, New-Bedford.

## THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY ALMANAC, FOR 1837!!

THIS DAY PUBLISHED, the American Anti-Slavery Almanac for 1837, which contains the usual astronomical calculations and chronological tables used in Almanacs, which have been prepared with great care. There is also much interesting and useful information on the subject of slavery, which it is believed will do much to throw light upon the question of immediate abolition. Great care has been taken to gather all interesting events and occurrences, and no labor has been withheld in obtaining valuable articles from distinguished writers. The Almanac is also embellished with several appropriate engravings, &c.

Among the articles are 'Free Discussion; Am. A. S. Society; \$100,000 Reward; Emancipation in the West Indies; Principles of Anti-Slavery Societies; the Slave Father; Produce of Slave Labor; Children's Department; Temptation Resisted; a Mother's Anguish; Slave Population in the United States; Emigrants to Liberia; Objections Considered; Onedia Institute; Anti-Slavery Publications.

All orders for the above work will be promptly answered. Address N. SOUTHWARD or D. K. HITCHCOCK, 9, Cornhill, Boston.  
Boston, July 30, 1836.

## SONGS OF THE FREE!

JUST PUBLISHED, and for sale at the Anti-Slavery Office, 46, Washington Street.—'SONGS OF THE FREE, AND HYMNS OF CHRISTIAN FREEDOM.' Suited to such as visit at the shrine of serious Liberty.—PERCIVAL.—pp. 228. Price 50 cts.

The work was prepared with particular reference to the Monthly Concert of prayer for the slaves, and will be found well suited for use at all Anti-Slavery meetings of which singing constitutes part of the exercises. It contains 119 hymns, proper for devotional exercises, beside an excellent selection of poetry, from writers of our own and past times, calculated to awaken a love of liberty, and excite sympathy for the injured and oppressed. Notes to illustrate and enforce the sentiments of the poetry, are interspersed through the volume. But the editor's advertisement will better present the occasion and design of the publication.

## EDITOR'S ADVERTISEMENT.

Those who are laboring for the freedom of the American slave, have felt their need of aid which has ever been sought by those in all ages who have striven for the good of their race; the encouragement, consolation and strength afforded by poetry and music. This generally expressed feeling was the origin of the present book of hymns with the accompanying strain of poetry; hardly less elevated, though more ornamented and diffuse than is allowed by the severe beauty and sublimity which should model the Christian Lyric.

They feel that the spiritual warfare in which they are engaged, requires the exercise of all the faculties; and they cannot allow the opponents of their principles the selection of the moral and intellectual powers with which shall be carried on—no, though this free use of their own souls should occasion men to call them agitators and fanatics. In giving man imagination and affections, God has furnished him with the powers that enable him to follow the dictates of reason and revelation; and he should not do otherwise than cultivate and sanctify all the faculties, subduing them to the obedience that is in Christ Jesus, by gladly acknowledging through them all, the fraternity of the human race.

## INFORMATION WANTED.

INFORMATION is wanted by Lettice Lamb, and Peggy Williams, her daughter, now residing in Norwich City, of Jordan Lamb, aged about 46, if now living,—of Antony Lamb, aged about 39, and of Thomas H. Lamb, aged about 37—sons of Lettice Lamb—all colored people. When last heard from, in 1821, they were in Portland or vicinity; one of them Thomas H. being about to sail from that port in a Brig, name unknown. Any information as to their present place of residence, if living, or, if dead, of the time, circumstances and place of death, or any facts respecting them, will be thankfully received. Papers in Portland and vicinity are requested to notice the above.

Letters should be addressed to Mrs. PEGGY WILLIAMS, Norwich City, Ct.  
July 23, 1836. 4t

## LECTURES OF GEORGE THOMPSON.

JUST PUBLISHED, and for sale at the Anti-Slavery Rooms, 46 Washington-street, Price 50 cts. LECTURES OF GEORGE THOMPSON, Esq., with a full report of his polemical contests with PETER BORTWICK, Esq., the advocate of the pro-slavery party in England. This work has been compiled from various English editions, and such lectures only selected as have a bearing on the general question of slavery throughout the world.  
May 15.

## LIST OF ANTI-SLAVERY PUBLICATIONS, for sale at the Anti-Slavery Office, No. 46 Washington-street, (3d story), Boston.

BOUND VOLUMES.	Per dozen.	Single.
Cabinet of Freedom, being a republication of standard works on the subject of Slavery, under the supervision of Hon. Wm. Jay, Rev. Prof. Bush, and Gerrit Smith, Esq. 12mo. pp. 270.	\$8.00	\$0.75
The Oasis, by Mrs. Child.	9.00	1.00
Channing on Slavery, (4th ed. revised) D. D. pp. 238.	3.00	.30
Right and Wrong in Boston.		
Slave's Friend, vol. 1st. (recently bound) Stroud's Sketch of Slave Laws.		
Mrs. Child's Appeal, (revised edition.) The Fountain, (a small pocket manual.) Life of Granville Sharpe, by C. Stuart, with a beautiful copper-plate likeness.		
Anti-Slavery Record, vol. 1st. bound.		
An Inquiry into the character of the American Colonization and Anti-Slavery Societies, by Hon. Wm. Jay.		
Bourne's Picture of Slavery in the United States.		
Rankin's Letters on Slavery in the U. S. Memoirs of Phillis Wheatley, a native African and a Slave.		
Memoir of James Jackson, a colored boy who died in Boston, Dec. 31, 1835, aged 6 years and 11 months.		
Thompson's Lectures and Debates in England.		
Songs of the Free, and Hymns of Christian Freedom. pp. 227.		
The Enemies of the Constitution Discussed, or an inquiry into the origin and tendency of popular violence. Containing an account of the Uica Mob—the dispersion of the State Convention—and a concise treatise on the practice of the Court of Judge Lynch.		

## PAMPHLETS.

Proceedings of the R. I. State Convention. Review of Remarks on Dr. Channing's book on Slavery.	50
Fourth Annual Report of the Mass. A. S. Society. 1st, 2d, and 3d do.	25
Second Annual Report American A. S. Society. Freedom's Defence, (being a review of Calhoun's Report.)	12
Child's Oration at South Reading, Aug. 1, 1834. Beriah Green's 4 Sermons.	12
Letter to a member of Congress, from an English Clergyman.	12
Immediate non-Gradual Emancipation. Report of Uica Convention.	12
Address of N. Y. Col. Young Men's A. S. Society. Juvenile Poems, for the use of free American children of every complexion.	12
Productions of Mrs. Maria Stewart. Anti-Slavery Catechism, by Mrs. Child. Account of interviews with the above named Committee.	12
A Sermon by Rev. C. Cutler of Windham, N. H. Trial of Prudence Crandall.	12
Garrison's Trial. Maryland Scheme, by a friend of liberty. West India Question, by Gerrit Smith.	12
A Thanksgiving Sermon, preached in the Chapel of St. Peter's Church, New York, 1835. By Rev. Thomas Paine, A. M.	12
Marriott's Address to the Society of Friends, on the duty of declining the use of the products of Slave labor.	12
May's letter to the Christian Examiner. British opinions of the Am. Colonization Society. Narrative of Amos Dresser, with Stowe's letter from Natchez—An obituary notice of the writer, and two letters from Tallahassee, relating to the treatment of slaves.	12
An Address to the Presbyterians of Kentucky, proposing a plan for the instruction and Emancipation of their slaves—by a committee of the Synod of Kentucky.	12
A Full Statement of reasons in part offered in the Committee of the Mass. Legislature, on the 4th & 8th of March.	12
Anti-Slavery Magazine, (Quarterly)	12
Injustice and impolicy of the Slave Trade, and of the slavery of the Africans. A sermon by Rev. Jonathan Edwards, preached in 1791.	12
Anti-Slavery Almanac. 50 cts per doz.	12
Wesleyan A. S. Herald, No. 1, containing Wesley's Thoughts on Slavery.	12
Thompson's Lecture at Salford, England.	12
Ecology in New Columbia. The engraving giving accurate views of the principal slave-trading establishments in the District, from drawings taken by an artist on the spot. A large quantity on hand. \$3.50 per hundred.	12
The Liberty Tree, a large lithographic print. Our Countrymen in Chains—kneeling slave, with poetry by J. G. Whittier.	12
Negro's Complaint, kneeling slave.	12
Declaration of Sentiment of Ohio Convention.	12
A sheet containing six views of slavery, viz. 1. Sugar plantation; 2. Mode of punishment; 3. Slave Auction; 4. Wrestling from a colored woman her free papers, in order to reduce her to slavery; 5. Tearing a little child from his mother's arms, and selling it to a slave trader; 6. Shipping slaves to New Orleans. (Lithographic.)	12
Birney on Colonization.	12
Birney's Letter to the Churches.	12
A lithographic print, representing the Court of Honor Judge Lynch, passing sentence upon the Fannities, and executing them on the Post Office at Charleston, S. C. a new method of settling the mail.	12
Cards, large size.	12
do. small size.	12
do. kneeling slave, copper plate.	12

Orders for any of the above publications will be promptly attended to, and packages forwarded according to direction to any part of New England. Address H. E. BENSON, No. 46 Washington-street, Boston.

## PORTRAIT OF MR. GARRISON.

THE subscriber has published a Portrait of Mr. GARRISON, engraved on steel by Sartain, from a picture by himself, copies of which may be obtained at 46, Washington-street, Boston—at the Anti-Slavery Office, New York—and at Mr. Benjamin C. Bacon, Philadelphia. Price of one dollar each, which is but one third the usual price for such engravings. The engraving is large, and done in the best English style of mezzotint, and is a faithful copy of the most intimate friends of Mr. GARRISON a very perfect likeness, in which opinion, the subscriber is happy to say, Mr. G. himself coincides. So pleased was Mr. THOMPSON with this picture, that a copy was made at his request, and taken with him to England. M. C. TORREY.  
3, Graphic Court.  
Boston, June 3, 1836.

## REPORT OF THE N. E. A. S. C.

THE REPORT of the New-England Anti-Slavery Convention is just published. Orders must be sent soon, as only a small edition was printed. For sale at 46 Washington-street.

Members of the Convention who have paid their assessment, are entitled to a copy of the Report, which they can have by applying at the Anti-Slavery Rooms.  
July 16.

## REV. MR. FITCH'S DISCOURSE.

REV. MR. FITCH'S Fourth of July Discourse, will be published on Monday next, and for sale at the A. S. Rooms, 46 Washington-street. Price 1-2 cents.  
July 16.